

THE TRADITION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

A SKETCH OF EUROPEAN HISTORY

WITH MAPS

BY

C. H. ST. L. RUSSELL, M.A.

ASSISTANT-MASTER AT CLIFTON COLLEGE

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON

1921

COPYRIGHT

PREFACE

THE author is indebted to his colleague, Mr. G. Curgenvén, for criticism of the original MS. and for suggestions which have in certain places modified its final form; also to Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw, whose kind revision of the book in proof has eliminated several inaccuracies, and made clearer much that might have been obscure. In the study of the earlier period assistance has courteously been given by Prof J. L. Myres; but for any opinions expressed on this doubtful period in the book itself the author is alone responsible. Thanks are due to Messrs. Emery Walker for their careful reproduction of the author's maps.

Where contribution has necessarily been levied on so many books and articles, it is not possible to make acknowledgement to all. In the opening chapters, most is owing to Ripley's *Races of Europe*, Sergi's *Mediterranean Race*, Myres's *Dawn of History*, Hogarth's *Ancient East*, and the *Authority and Archaeology* edited by him; in the body of the book, the main debt is to the recognised authorities, Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*, Prescott's *Ferdinand and*

Isabella and *Philip the Second*, Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic* and *United Netherlands*, and Ranke's *History of the Popes*, in the closing scene, advantage has been taken of the little *Oxford Pamphlets* issued at the beginning of the War: while, throughout, continual reference has been made to Carl Ploetz's *Epitomé of History*.

Of the object of the book, little need nowadays be said. The view, long recognised on the Continent, has, even before the War, been gaining ground in England—that to appreciate the history of any individual European country some knowledge is necessary of the history of Europe as a whole; and the present volume differs from several others which have preceded it only perhaps in beginning somewhat further back, and in regarding, as the heart of the whole matter, Rome. If any further support were required for the general view, it has just been cruelly supplied by the recent great European War itself; to which indeed—one may hope, as its last climax—the Tradition of the Roman Empire, here dealt with, may, through the long, troubled centuries, be said to lead.

.CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	V
INTRODUCTORY—	
CHAP	
I 1. The Making of the Roman Empire . . .	3
II. 2 Rome and the Conquest of the World . .	29
III. 3. Overthrow of the Roman Empire by the Bar- barians	49
THE TRADITION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE—	
IV. 1 800-1254 First Teuton Attempt “Holy Roman Empire” (Papal Period) . . .	81
V. 2 1254-1437 Break-up of Empire and Emer- gence of France	115
VI. 3 1437-1648 Second Teuton Attempt Haps- burgs of Austria and Spain (Reformation Period)	137
VII. 4. 1648-1815 French bid for Empire· Bourbons, and Napoleon	175
VIII. 5 1815-1914 Third Teuton Attempt. Hohen- zollerns of Prussia (Revolution Period) . .	207
APPENDICES (for reference)—	
1. List of Emperors	251
2 Ethnological Table	254
3. Summary of Individual States	260
INDEX	265

MAPS

(At end of Book)

1. EUROPE IN 364 A.D.
Roman Empire at its height
(Position of Teutonic invaders.)
2. EUROPE IN 476 A.D.
Fall of Rome.
(Visigoth period.)
3. EUROPE IN 800 A.D.
Charlemagne's "Holy Roman Empire" · Franks.
(Saracen conquests.)
4. EUROPE IN 962 A.D.
First Teuton attempt Empire of Otto the Great.
(Magyars, Fatimites, etc)
5. EUROPE IN 1190 A.D.
Death of Frederick I Barbarossa
(Seljuk Turks, and the Crusades)
6. EUROPE IN 1559 A.D.
Second Teuton attempt. Hapsburgs of Austria and Spain.
(Height of Ottoman Empire)
7. EUROPE IN 1811 A.D.
Napoleon's Empire at its height
Culmination of great French effort begun by Bourbons.
(With dates of later Battles and Treaties.)
8. EUROPE IN 1914 A.D.
Third Teuton attempt · Hohenzollerns of Prussia.
(With dates of unity of European states.)

INTRODUCTORY: THE ROMAN EMPIRE

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER I

THE MAKING OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Rome as the Hub of History.

A. Early Races in Europe

(a) *Advent from the South · the Iberians of the New Stone Age.*

Iberians in Spain , Ligurians in Italy , Pelasgians in Greece.

(b) *Influence from the East the Phoenicians and the Introduction of Metals.*

Turanian, Hamitic, Semitic races —the Hittites, the Cretans.

Descent of the Achaeans, and overthrow of the Minoan world.

Emergence of the Phoenicians : the foundation of Carthage

B Descent of the Aryans from the North.

. In Asia, Iranians and Hindoos , in Europe—

(1) Celts (Goidels, Brythons) Gaul, Spain, Britain, N. Italy.

(2) Teutons (Norse, Germans) : round south of Baltic

(3) Slavs (Venedae, Sarmatians) Poland and Lithuania

(4) Greeks (Achaeans, Dorians) · Greece, Asia Minor, S Italy,
E Sicily.

(5) Italians (Latins, Umbro-Sabellians) Central Italy.

C. Gradual Trend of Empire to the West.

(1) Accad and Sumer (Turanian).

(2) Egypt, North and South (Hamitic).

(3) Babylon and Assyria (Semitic)

(4) Media and Persia (Aryan)

(5) Greek Empire of Alexander of Macedon (Aryan).

CHAPTER I

THE MAKING OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

A GREAT historian once said that, to understand the story of modern nations, "We must ever be thinking of *Rome*, ever looking to *Rome*, sometimes looking forward to it, sometimes looking back to it, but always having *Rome* in mind as the centre of the whole story."

The results of the fall of Rome have lasted to the present day. We cannot understand these results without understanding the circumstances of the fall itself. And to understand the fall of Rome, we must understand the elements out of which Rome came into being. At only one point can the story be started: at the very beginning.

From some of the early nations of Europe—even from some outside Europe—the Roman Empire was formed; owing to the action of some of them it was ultimately overthrown; by some of them the attempt has been made, again and again, to revive its imperial power. There is to-day hardly a state in Europe which has not been in some way or other, as friend or foe, connected with the Roman Empire: most of them owe their existence, directly or indirectly, to its growth, its fall, or its revival.

And the question of these early nations is the more

important, because, with all the intermixture of races, which the vicissitudes of Rome, through the long centuries, have seen, blood, even diluted, has ever remained thicker than water. The Celt, as he was at the beginning, is still fiery, impulsive, and superstitious; the Italian is still lazy and mercenary; the Greek, still quick-witted, versatile, treacherous; the Slav, still servile and unstable; the Teuton, as he was in the days of Marius and of Caesar, still warlike and aggressive, still the troubler of the peace of Europe. Saracen, Mongol, Turk—all the Mahommedan peoples who have intruded into Europe from the East—still retain their old oriental character: fanatical, venal, and corrupt, opposed to all progress, incapable of governing themselves or others, lost—except when busy with sedition—in uxorious ease.

In the great World-War, which is just over—itsself the outcome of the tradition of imperial Rome—even now, after all the conquests and defeats of past ages, amid all the various states which have risen out of them, under all the influences of fear, duty, interest, which actuated the combatants on either side, we still find, for good or evil, the sense of Nationality surviving, still see the peoples, who are related in blood, even when they inhabit different districts—Magyars, Poles, Serbs, Roumanians, Greeks, Latins, Germans themselves—endeavouring to realise their national unity: a sense, and an endeavour, unintelligible except with an understanding of their whole history—which is the history of the Roman Empire—from the most distant past up to present times.

For Rome was the sum of all the ages—of all the peoples, nations, empires which had preceded her, not merely in Europe, but elsewhere as well. Even the very earliest of these took some part in the making of Rome, or assisted

in her undoing, or contributed something to all that followed on her fall.

A. EARLY RACES IN EUROPE

(a) *Advent from the South: the Iberians of the New Stone Age*

Peoples had come up from the South, crossing by the land-bridges, for Europe was then joined to Africa and Asia at Spain, Italy, and Thrace, and the Mediterranean was then a double inland sea; and so passing on by land, or sea, to Britain, for Britain was only then ceasing to form one continent with Norway and France:—the dark little people of the New Stone Age¹ (circ. 5000–2000 B.C.): “Iberians” in Spain, Gaul, Britain, “Ligurians” in Italy, Sicily; “Pelasgians” in Greece and Asia Minor; farther north, “Finns,” “Lapps,” and others; all alike now often called by the general name Iberians, from their clearest survivors, the Basques of N.E. Iberia, or Spain.

Even these earliest peoples had formed a layer—the first layer—in the building of the Roman Empire: the Pelasgians helping also to lay the next.

(b) *Influence from the East the Phoenicians and the Introduction of Metals*

Peoples had come from the East, spreading fresh culture over the Mediterranean area in successive racial waves: *Turanians* of Accad and Sumer, source of the wild “Scythian” tribes, embodying the earliest known civilisation in the world; *Hamites* of immemorial Egypt, originat-

¹ Between the “Palaeolithic” or Old Stone Age, and the “Neolithic” or New Stone Age, a great glacial epoch intervened—an epoch covered by what is now sometimes called the “Mesolithic” or Middle Stone Age. As the ice receded, Europe gradually assumed its present shape. Of the

ing from mythic "Punt," further south; *Semites*, flooding up from Arabia in three great migrations, known as the "Accadian," "Canaanite" or "Amoritic," and "Aramean" (2500, 2000, 1350 B.C.), occupying Babylon, and pouring on through Mesopotamia to Canaan and the Syrian coast.

Springing from these, but from which of them we do not know,¹ the *Cretans*, or "Keftiu," people of Caphtor—Pelagian perhaps in origin, certainly connected with Egypt—had early (3000 B.C.) extended their influence over the islands from Sicily on the west to Cyprus on the east, and up the mainland of Greece northward to the borders of Thessaly; while an equally mysterious and even earlier people, the *Hittites*,² or Khatti, "children of Heth"—often at war both with Egypt and Babylon—had established themselves in Cappadocia, and from there presently (circ. 1300) moved S.E. to Carchemish in N. Syria.—All of these peoples—Babylonians, Egyptians, Hittites, Cretans—possessed, and spread, a culture of their own, but it was

first of the Old-Stone men—the men of the "Mammoth" Period, or "River-drift" men (so called from the localities where their relics are found), probably hairy little people, not more than five feet high—no known descendants remain; from their successors, the "Cave-dwellers" of the Reindeer Period, the Esquimaux are believed to be derived. All the circumstances of the Mesolithic Age are at present conjectural. Little account need be taken of any early people before the Iberians of the New Stone Age.

¹ Cretan or Minoan culture, as it is called from Minos, a mythical king of Greece, is divided into—(1) 3000 B.C., "Early Minoan"; (2) 3000–1600 B.C., "Middle Minoan"; and (3) 1600–1100 B.C., "Late Minoan"; the last being known also as "Mycenaean," from the Achaean city of Mycenae—a period which marks the height of the Age of Bronze.

² The history of the Hittites may, for convenience, be briefly summarised—(1) 3000–2000 B.C., *First phase* of power, Cappadocia, capital Boghazkeu, extend westward in Asia Minor; (2) 2000–1700 B.C., affected by Babylon, (3) 1700–1550 B.C., *Second phase*, invade Syria, overthrow Babylon, and establish "Hyksos" in Egypt, (4) 1550–1350 B.C., driven back by Egypt, (5) 1350–1150 B.C., *Third phase*, extend eastward to N. Syria, capital Carchemish; (6) 1150–850 B.C., curtailed by Greeks on W. by Arameans on E., (7) 850–717 B.C., fall to Assyria.—The culture of the Hittites was affected by Babylonian influence.

mainly by another people that the culture of all of them was carried west.

Suddenly, circ 1600 B.C., on to these Mediterranean peoples descended from the North new and strange tribes, calling themselves the "Achaeans": who overwhelmed the Pelasgians of Greece and (1400) Crete, and twice (1235, 1200) raided Egypt itself by sea. About the same time, other tribes, the "Phrygians"—cousins of the Achaeans—had settled on the coast of Asia Minor, north of Lydia. Lastly, the Achaeans attacked their Phrygian cousins, now allies of the Hittites, and captured their capital, in the long "Trojan War" (1194–1184 B.C.). General unrest in the Aegean attended these movements: in the course of which the *Pelasgians*¹ fled from Crete to Palestine; the "*Etruscans*"² began to make their way from Lydia to Italy; and a body of *Phrygians*—according to legend—sailed off from burning Troy on a voyage which was to end in "Rome"

But this break-up of the old "Minoan" world—as it is called from Minos, a mythical king of Crete—had enabled the emergence of the **Phoenicians**³ (1200–1000 B.C.), a Hamito-Semitic people of Tyre, the first great navigators

¹ "Pelasgian," "Palestine," "Philistine" are all the same word. The connexion of the Pelasgians with Egypt partly accounts for the determined hostility shown by the Philistines to the Jews on the arrival of the latter in Palestine after their Egyptian Exodus

² The movement of the Etruscans, Tuscans, or, as they called themselves, "Rasena," is generally considered as a western and later counterpart of the Pelasgian migration to Palestine. But whether they arrived in Italy directly by sea, or came by land—by way of the Rhaetian Alps—mingling on their way with Alpine peoples, is uncertain; the date of their arrival between 1100 and 800 is not clear, and their language, art, and racial affinities have puzzled ethnologists from all time.

³ The Phoenicians seem to have come from the head of the Persian Gulf about 2000 B.C. to the strip of coast known in Egyptian as "Kopt," in Greek "Phoenicia," the "Land of Palms" founding there nine cities, of which Byblus (or Gebal), Sidon, and Tyre rose in turn to prominence. They were primarily a Semitic people and retained to the last their Semitic speech; but became mixed with Hamitic elements, and the culture they spread was in the main Egyptian

of antiquity, who now conveyed the use of metals, and many of the arts of life round the Mediterranean,* through the Black Sea and up the Danube valley. They brought with them copper from Cyprus, steel from Damascus, gold from Thasos, tin from Britain, amber from the Baltic, purple from their own Tyre, the alphabet from Egypt; were the chief agents in spreading oriental culture over the Aegean area; and, generally, linked up East and West. They carried on the work of Crete, Egypt, and Babylon, and, in a way, sum up the Mediterranean Age. About 800 B.C. the Phoenicians founded *Carthage*: a new focus, from which Eastern civilisation spread along the coasts of Africa, Sicily, and Spain.

These Eastern peoples had laid, as it were, a second layer in the foundation of Rome. The Romans themselves came probably from the East; they were early affected by Etruria; and with Carthage they had to contend, by and by, for the Empire of the World; while Phoenician enterprise gave to Roman history its first main oriental cast. (See Appendix II., Note 1: Mediterranean Culture.)

B. THE COMING OF THE ARYANS FROM THE NORTH

Most of all, peoples had come from the North. If the earlier Turanian, Hamitic, Semitic peoples from the South and East had laid the first foundations of the Roman Empire, it was by the Aryans from the North that the main fabric of Empire had been built.

The Aryan ("Indo-Germanic" or "Indo-European") race began to move probably about 2000 B.C.: the date of the great Second Semite migration, which was perhaps half caused by Aryan unrest. It came either from Ariana, near

Persia (hence "Aryan"), or from the great Germanic plain, S.E. of the Baltic (hence "Indo-Germanic"), or—more probably—from the steppes of S.E. Russia in Europe (hence "Indo-European"). It consisted of seven main groups: all speaking inflexional languages, which were once apparently one tongue. Compare, for instance, the words for "father": German "Vater," Italian "padre," French "père," Greek "patēr," Latin "pater," Sanskrit (Hindoo) "pitrī," Zend (Persian) "patar." Two of these groups, the *Iranians* (Persians, etc.) and *Hindoos*, descended in Asia; the other five, the *Celts*, *Teutons*, *Slavs*, *Greeks*, and *Italians*, descended in Europe: moving first westward, then southward; acquiring, as they moved, the use of metals¹ from the Phoenicians along the Danube, and bringing with them, of their own, the use of the horse, the practice of cremation, and a fresh vigour which enabled them to overcome the more effeminate peoples of the Mediterranean area.

The Celts undoubtedly moved first; and, being the first, their arrival is specially marked with the introduction of cremation and the use of bronze. The order of the rest is uncertain; but it is noticeable that all alike seem to have moved, or, at any rate, ended, in two divisions—often a northern and a southern group. And, with all, there was much intermixture with the peoples they subdued.

1. The Celts, then, were the first to move, subduing with

¹ The Palaeolithic or Old Stone Age of Europe began in an unknown past, the Neolithic or New Stone Age circ. 5000 B.C.; the Bronze Age circ. 2000 B.C., the Iron Age circ. 1200 B.C.: with ever lessening intervals. Thus, the arrival of the Celts in Gaul and of the Achaeans in Greece, circ. 1600 B.C., marks the climax of the Age of Bronze, that of the Dorians in Greece the beginning of the Age of Iron. But the date and duration of the different "Ages" differed, of course, in different countries: in some countries, one or the other "Age" was almost, or quite, omitted. The idea that the Aryans invented the use of metals is now commonly rejected: it is doubtful if their advent was even anything more than coincident in time with its introduction.

bronze weapons the stone-using Iberians, and often mingling with them; and the two groups in which they moved were the "*Goidels*," or "Gaels," a northern group, and the "*Brythons*" (Britons), or "Cymri," a southern group: known also respectively as the "Q" or "K" Celts, and the "P" Celts. Contrast for instance, the word for "head": Kintyre in Scotland, Pentyre in Cornwall. They moved slowly, working westward along the mountain ranges of central Europe, and leaving offshoots of themselves as they went, possibly in Greece and Italy, probably in Bohemia, certainly in several parts of Germany: until about 1600 B.C. they arrived in *Gaul*, which became henceforth the chief focus of their tribe. "Gallic," "Gaelic," "Celtic" are various forms of the same word.

From Gaul (1) they began about 1000 B.C. to make their way over the Pyrenees into *Spain*, where they formed with the natives a mixed race—the "Celtiberi" (2) About 800 B.C. they began crossing the Channel to the *British Isles*: first the Gaels in two branches—the Picts ("painted" people) to the Highlands of N. Scotland, the "Scots" ("tattooed" people) into Ireland and so to the lowlands of Scotland in the south; then the Brythons, or Britons, to Britain, which henceforth bore their name.¹ (3) About 600 B.C. they passed the Alps into *N. Italy*: where, to distinguish them from their brethren in Gaul itself, they were called by the Romans the "Cisalpine" Gauls. This last contingent in 278 B.C. unsuccessfully invaded Greece, but found a footing in Asia Minor, where the province of "Galatia" long retained their name

¹ On the Anglo-Saxon conquest circ. A.D. 450–600 the British Celts were driven to the west of the island, especially to Cornwall and to Wales—the last so-called from the "Volcae," a Celtic tribe. And it was then that some of them fled back across the Channel to their old Gallic home, and established "Brittany." *

The Celts were a nation of horsemen, specially skilled in the use of the chariots, which were armed, in Britain, with scythes attached to the axles of the wheels and below the car. They were long-haired, wore breeches, and often daubed the upper part of the body with dark-blue woad: an impulsive, superstitious people even then, less subject to their tribal chiefs than to their priests, the Druids, who practised human sacrifice. To the Celts are due many of the so-called "Roman Camps," where these are round, not square; most of the "pile-dwellings" on the lakes of Switzerland; the majority of the "merlins" (standing stones), "dolmens" (stone-chambers), and "cromlechs" (circles of stones), but especially the "megalithic" or large-stone monuments, formed probably first as sepulchres but later connected with religious rites, such as Stone-henge, in which signs of cremation can still be traced.

2. The Teutons appear early in the territory, which roughly they occupy to-day; and already, as to-day, pressed westward and southward on the Celts. They also, like the Celts, appear from the first in two main groups: the pure "*Scandinavians*" of Norway, Sweden, Denmark to the north; and below the Baltic, the "*Germans*," mingling more and more with the Celts, as they got further south or west, more and more with the Slavs, further to the east. They were a tall people, with blue eyes and red hair; wore little clothing; and, even in those days, "considered brigandage as no disgrace," "had no regard for treaties," and drank beer. Then, as now, their main concern was war; and, even then, "the wider the devastation they spread round them, the greater was their pride."

3. The Slavs. As the Celts were pressed westward by the Teutons, so the Teutons themselves were pressed westward by the Slavs: these being in turn pressed still further

westward by various Turanian tribes, vaguely called "Scythians," from Asia—a continuous pressure to the west, ending, as with the Teutons, in a southward tendency. The first home of the Slavs is believed to have been in the neighbourhood of Poland and Lithuania; but the Slavs also, like the Celts and Teutons, are found early in two groups, a northern and a southern, known to the Romans as the "*Venedae*" and "*Sarmatians*" respectively: wild tribes, brutal, cultureless, unreliable then as now; ranging the great plains from the Baltic to the Urals; less known in spite of their numbers—they outnumber all the other Aryan peoples—than any other European folk.

These three peoples, the Celts, the Teutons, the Slavs, form almost a separate system along the north. For the most part, the Rhine formed an early boundary between the Celts and the Teutons, the Elbe between the Teutons and the Slavs: but both boundaries were frequently crossed, and there was constant overlapping between the three. Meantime, two other Aryan peoples, earlier civilised, the Greeks and the Italians, had been settling into their new homes along the east and south.

4. The **Greeks** (*Hellēnes*) probably entered in small numbers the land that was to bear their name: a people artistic, versatile, treacherous, liars, ingrates from the first. The descent of the *Achaean*s from the mountains of Thessaly; their conquest of the Pelasgians in Greece and Crete; and the general unrest they caused among the islands: have already—along with the descent of their cousins, the Phrygians, in Asia Minor—been described. Their arrival in the Peloponnese, like that of the Celts in Gaul, dates about 1600–1400 B.C., and is marked by the introduction of cremation and the use of bronze; and, like the Celts, they were a "long-haired" people, "tamers of horses,"

builders of megalithic monuments: the Celtic "bee-hive" huts strongly recall the ruins of certain large-stoned "Cyclopean" erections at Mycenae and Tiryns in Achæan Greece.—In 1124 B.C. came a second wave, that of the *Dorians*, massed infantry armed with iron, from Epirus and Illyria: conquering the bronze-equipped Achæans themselves, re-subduing the previous Pelasgian inhabitants, and completing the disruption of the old Minoan world. Their advent gave a wild impulse to a process which had begun already: the dispersion of many of the Greeks themselves in colonies—eastward to Asia Minor and the Black Sea, southward to Africa, westward to S. Italy, even S. Gaul and Spain. In Italy the Greek settlements were so many that the "boot" of the Peninsula was called "Magna Graecia."

5. The *Italians*. If the Aryan invaders of Greece were few in number, those of Italy were probably fewer still: possibly materialised as the fickle, light-fingered, mercenary "Italians" only in Italy itself. Along the banks of the Po (Padus), where is some access to N.E. Italy from the Danube valley round the coast, are found certain four-square "terrामare" settlements, pile-dwellings on land, dating from "æneolithic" times, when the use of bronze was encroaching on that of stone, and once inhabited by men who burnt their dead: structures oddly suggestive of the future four-square Roman camp. Here, somewhere about 1500 B.C., a little band of adventurers, speaking a tongue closely allied to Greek and themselves akin perhaps to the Greeks, probably first appeared; intermarried with Ligurian natives, forming the nucleus of the Italian race, then, swollen in time to a great host, moved slowly south. They moved apparently in two main waves: first the *Latins*, who occupied the low-lying plains on the coast of

Latium—"latus," the side, of Italy, then the various *Sabellian* tribes (Samnites, Sabines, Umbrians, and others—the "Italians" of later history¹), who worked their way along the central mountain-range.

Further progress southward was stopped by the Greek settlements already established about the foot of Italy. Meantime, while the Italian movement was still in progress, the Etruscans, somewhere between 1100 and 800 B.C., arrived by sea or land—it is uncertain which—on the west coast above Latium. And, by and by, circ. 600 B.C., as we mentioned, Celts from Gaul came down from the north over the Alps. The Italians were left shut into central Italy.—From so small a nucleus was the Roman Empire to be born.

These are the five Aryan peoples of Europe, showing even in early times the characteristics which have marked them ever since, and which no intermixture or conquest has ever entirely obscured. Out of three of them, the Italians, the Greeks, the Celts, Rome was presently to create her empire; by the other two, the Teutons and the Slavs, that empire was to be overthrown.—Even the Aryan Persians in distant Asia were temporarily to form a fringe of the Roman Empire, and finally to assist its fall.

C. THE GRADUAL TREND OF EMPIRE FROM EAST TO WEST

The stage is now roughly set for the entrance of Rome upon the scene, so far as Europe is concerned. But mean-

¹ The term "Italian" is used by writers in three distinct senses: (1) the whole of the Aryan invaders of Italy; (2) the Umbro-Sabellian half of these; (3) the original "Iberian" inhabitants, Ligurians, Sicels, and others.—The word is said to be derived from "vitulus," a calf. Italy was given to cattle-grazing from the first.

while, amid these movements of peoples—Turanian, Hamitic, Semitic, Aryan—a succession of Empires in the same racial sequence had materialised: Empires, absorbing each of them the one before, trending ever more and more from east to west, and leading, no less than the peoples themselves, directly up to Rome. Two of them, the Turanian, covering at its height perhaps a period 4000–2000 B.C., and the Hamitic, the zenith of whose power was about 2000–1000 B.C., have already been touched upon. Together, they embrace the Mediterranean Era, which has been partially described. But their history—preparatory to that of the Semitic Empire, circ. 1000–500 B.C., and of the Aryan Empires which followed this—may, from the imperial point of view, be briefly here resumed.

1. **Accad and Sumer** (Turanian: circ 4000–2000 B.C.) had embodied, as we mentioned, the earliest known civilisation in the world. It was, for instance, from the Sumerian script that the Babylonian was derived; and an Accadian account of the Creation has been found to underlie the Assyrian. The earliest known Empire, centring now in Accad, now in Sumer, had also sprung from them: an empire, which once, in a dim and distant past, seems to have spread westward as far as Asia Minor on the north, and as far as Egypt on the south, eastward, to regions undefined—an empire which the wild Scythians, the Huns, the Mongols, the Turks, all Turanian in origin, were to aim at reproducing in later days. The Hittites, well established in Asia Minor by 3000 B.C., have been thought to emanate from Accad; and the Pelasgians of Crete, if, as some think, they were of Turanian race, may in the first instance have been an offshoot of the same.—The *Cretans* were overthrown by the Aryan Achaeans, 1600–1100 B.C., the *Hittites*, already crippled by the same power on the

west, were destined, after spreading to northern Syria, crushing Babylon, and humiliating Egypt, to fall finally, 717 B.C., to Assyria on the east (see note, p. 8); *Accad* and *Sumer* themselves, after intermittent encroachment by Egypt, were fated to be mainly known in history as having, in 2000 B.C., formed the nuclei of the great Empires of Assyria and Babylon.

2. **Egypt** (Hamitic: circ. 2000-1000 B.C.) had next taken up the tale of Empire. (1) Her power, like that of *Accad* and *Sumer*, dated from an immemorial past: beginning under the "*Old Kingdom*"—the Pyramid kings of N Egypt, whose capital was at Memphis (Dynasties I-XI.; circ. 5000-3000 B.C.). Internal trouble, however, produced a gradual decline; and it is (2) with the monarchs of the "*Middle Kingdom*," reigning in S Egypt at Thebes (Dynasties XII-XIV.: circ. 3000-2000 B.C.), especially under the XIIth Dynasty, that Egypt attained her chief earlier influence: an influence extending round the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, and up, through Crete and the islands, into Greece itself. Then once more came a check with the invasion of Egypt by the Hittites of Asia Minor: drawing with it a host of Phoenicians, Habiri or Hebrews, and others, and establishing a foreign dynasty, the "Hyksos" or Shepherd-kings, for a century on the Egyptian throne. During this disastrous period, circ. 1700-1600 B.C., the Hyksos seemed to have reigned supreme in northern Egypt, while the Theban kings (Dynasties XV.-XVII.) lurked in obscurity among their marshes to the south.

The expulsion of the Hyksos was completed under the XVIIIth Dynasty, and (3) what is known as the "*New Kingdom*" (Dynasties XVIII.-XX.: circ. 1600-1100 B.C.) was established under Theban auspices. The first 200 years of this kingdom, 1550-1350 B.C., mark the most glorious period

of Egyptian Empire. Under the great conquerors Thothmes III and Amenotep III., Canaan, Syria, and Mesopotamia were occupied to the north—partly in revenge for the Hittite invasion, partly as a measure of precaution against the recurrence of a like episode; while to the south imperial sway was extended over Nubia. The climax of prosperity was reached under their successor, Amenotep IV., or “Akhenaten,” famous for his religious reforms carried in the teeth of the Egyptian priests.¹ But already an internal decline had once more begun, which continued even under the military monarchs of the XIXth Dynasty, Rameses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and his son Merenptah, Pharaoh of the Exodus²; and, with a revolt of the priestly caste towards the close of the XXth Dynasty, the New Kingdom came, circ 1100, to an end.

Meantime, the Egyptian Empire had been driven further and further back from the north by the Hittite expansion

¹ Famous even more for the records, recently discovered, of his reign.—At *Tel el-Amarna*, on the site of a new capital built by Amenotep IV., 170 miles south of Cairo, were unearthed in 1887 more than 300 clay tablets: part of the official archives of Amenotep III. and IV.,—letters from the governor of Jerusalem and other magistrates. These letters, written in the Babylonian (!) tongue, show that circ 1400 B.C. Palestine was an Egyptian province, but that Egyptian authority was now threatened by the Hittites and other tribes.

² The Jews had found their way to Canaan, circ 2000 B.C., in the course of the Second Semitic movement, known as the “Canaanite” or “Amoritic”—in Bible narrative, the wandering of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees. The expulsion of the Hyksos, with whom they had entered Egypt, and the restoration of the native Theban kings—“kings that knew not Joseph”—made their position in Egypt, after the reign of Akhenaten, untenable, and the Exodus circ. 1200, followed by the re-conquest of Canaan from the south, was the result. The Jewish kingdom of Saul, David, and Solomon began circ 1050, its division into Israel and Judah, circ 950—Israel fell to Assyria in 722; Judah to Babylon in 586—the Returns from Captivity occurring in Persian times (538–331). On the overthrow of Persia by Alexander, Palestine became subject to his Greek kingdoms, first to Egypt, then to Syria (323–168). But the oppression of the latter caused a revolt of the Jews under the *Maccabees* (168–40) until a quarrel among them brought in the *Herodians*, under Roman patronage.

from Cappadocia to Carchemish in upper Syria; below this, by the Aramaic occupation of Damascus, and, below this again, by the Jewish kingdom of David and Solomon. While the descent of the Aryan Greeks on to the Aegean had now extended, in sea-raids, to Egypt itself. By and by Ethiopia began to express herself (circ. 800 B.C.) to the detriment of Egypt on the south. Lastly, to the east, the growing power of Babylon and Assyria, her life-long enemy, was destined ultimately to include the Egyptian Empire—like that of Accad and Sumer—in its ambitious grasp.

3. **Assyria** (Semitic · circ. 1000–606 B.C.). The date 1000 B.C. marks an epoch in the succession of Empires. Hitherto, Turanian and Hamitic influences had dominated the Mediterranean: Semitic influence was now to supervene. The break-up of the old “Minoan” world—the Cretan, Hittite, and Egyptian powers—with the advent of the Aryans, circ. 1600–1000, had enabled the emergence of many minor states. In Asia Minor, Aryan *Phrygia* at one end, *Cilicia* of doubtful nationality at the other, freed from Hittite control, had begun to play a part, the former engrossing most of the Hittite inheritance to the west, while, between the two, in the west centre, *Lydia*, semitised at some date unknown, was beginning, though overshadowed at present by Phrygia, to build up a power of her own.

Further east, in Syria the Semitic *Aramaeans* of Damascus were curtailing the Hittite Empire on the other side, and beginning to threaten the Hebrews to the south. The *Hebrews*, profiting by the decline of the Hittites on the north and Egypt on the south, had formed a united kingdom, supported by alliance with Phoenician Tyre. Of the Semitic *Phoenicians* themselves and the growth of their

maritime power with the decline of Crete and Egypt, we have spoken above. And now, still further east, the Semitic *Babylonians* and *Assyrians*, building on the runs of Sumer and Accad, were beginning to feel their way to bigger things.—So far (circ. 1000 B.C.) no one of these states had become predominant over the rest. But first Babylon and then Assyria were emerging gradually; and, by and by, Assyria was able, by the final conquest of the Hittites and of Egypt, to complete from the east the work already begun by the Achaeans from the west, to reduce the minor powers into subjection, and create a third Empire of wide and definite intent.

(a) *First Babylonian Supremacy*, circ. 2000–1700 B.C. Accad, the northern district, had been seized by one “Sargon of Accad” as early as 2500 B.C.,¹ in the first Semitic migration; but this initial kingdom had been overthrown by a revolt of the Sumerians from the south. It was not till 2000 B.C. in connexion with the second Semitic movement, that Semitic Empire in Mesopotamia became a real thing. And now, Babylon, or Chaldaea (Sumer) was predominant; Assyria or Asshur (Accad) began only as an offshoot of Babylon: and for three great centuries Babylon rose rapidly in power. This power had just reached its height under the famous *Hammurabi*² (Amraphel),—an empire stretching to Syria and Asia Minor on the west: when suddenly, from the latter place, circ. 1700 B.C., the Hittite movement, which set the Hyksos on the throne of Egypt, swerved aside, on its way, and crippled Babylon.

(b) *Assyrian Empire*: circ. 1000–606 B.C. And now Assyria gradually emerged; became mistress, in her turn,

¹ His date is put much earlier by some authorities (Appendix II.).

² Hammurabi is the author of the first known code of laws—a code engraved on marble, now in the British Museum.—On this westward extension of Babylon, see note on the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets, *sup* p. 19

of Babylon, and achieved a power greater even than the Babylonian. Her Empire, beginning in the form of yearly Bedouin raids, reached its first height under the great conqueror, *Shalmanezzer II.*, circ. 850 B.C. But, with the accession of *Tiglath-Pilezer*, or *Pul*, circ. 750 B.C., a new era begins. The Assyrian armies, hitherto recruited for each foray, were made a standing force; resident governors and garrisons were placed in conquered provinces; and the Assyrian capital, first fixed at Asshur, then moved further north to Calah, was transferred, still further up the Tigris, to Nineveh. The climax of Empire was reached by *Sargon III.*, 722–705. To the east, Media, Persia, Elam already acknowledged Assyrian authority. To the west, the Aramaeans were now subdued; Samaria, the northern kingdom of the Jews, fell in 722, and the Egyptian Sabaco, their ally, was defeated, the Hittites, already curtailed in Asia Minor by the Greeks, were finally crushed in Syria by the destruction of Carchemish their capital in 717, and the whole Hittite Empire, as far as Phrygia—and Lydia, at this time, half subject to Phrygia—was under Assyrian rule. In 709 Sargon captured Babylon itself. Presently, to the south, the conquest of Egypt in 650 by *Assurbanipul* (the Sardanapalus of the Greeks, “the great and noble Asnapper” of Scripture) completed an Empire which embraced both of the Empires which had preceded it; stretched further than either to the west; and suggested, for the first time in history, the dream of an Empire of the World.

(c) *Second Supremacy of Babylon*: 606–538 B.C. But the colossus was already tottering to its fall. Waiting enemies even now surrounded Assyria on every side; about 635, a wild Scythian invasion swept over the whole Empire from end to end, totally destroying Phrygia on the west; and

when this was past, Nineveh, the Assyrian capital, fell in 606 to the Babylonians and Medes. Babylon, though threatened by Media on the north, now came by her own. In 586, under *Nebuchadnezzar*, she captured Jerusalem, the southern Jewish kingdom, shortly afterwards renewed the subjection of Egypt; and, for seventy years (606—538), rose to higher heights of glory even than before.

4. Aryan Persia and Media.¹ But the fall of Assyria enabled the rise also of three other powers beside *Babylon*, her old superior. In the N.E., the *Medes*—Aryans, but now much mixed with Scythian blood—had already subjected their cousins, the Persians, to the south, and extended their kingdom as far as the Halys, in Asia Minor, to the west. In the N.W. the Semitic *Lydians*, just freed, by the Scythian disaster, from Phrygian control, now, under their famous King Croesus, conquered the Greek colonies on the western coast, and carried their kingdom eastward to the Halys: where they met, once in war, but now in friendship, with the Medes. In the S.W., the Hamitic *Egyptians* emerged sufficiently under Pharaoh Necho to lay claim once more on Palestine.

Such was the position when, about 560, an Elamite king, of pure Aryan blood, who had become king also of Persia, *Cyrus the Elder*, began, under the Persian name, a course of conquest, which in a little over thirty years was to lay all four powers low, and combine, out of them, another Empire—the first Aryan Empire—wider than that of Assyria itself and extending even further to the west. The Median yoke was easily thrown off in 559. Lydia,

¹ It is curious how these Mesopotamian Empires—like the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary—run in pairs sometimes one getting the upper hand, sometimes the other. The history of them is almost invariably the same. A hardy mountain race easily overcomes the enervated dwellers on the plains, to become enervated in its turn, and, in its turn, to fall to another and a harder tribe.

ally of Media, fell next, in 546; and the Greek colonies, now subject to Lydia, soon followed suit. Babylon¹ was captured in 538. At this point Cyrus died, fighting against a Scythian tribe. But Egypt was reduced by his son *Cambyses* in 528. And the huge Empire was organised in "Satrapies" or provinces by *Darius*, the third king: an eastern Empire reaching for the first time westward to the Aegean Sea.

Persia was now looking straight across at European Greece; and the attack on Greece itself could only be a matter of time. A revolt of the Greek colonies, abetted by Athens, from their new masters, soon supplied the occasion. Three invasions of Greece followed (492, 490, 480): the first two launched by *Darius*, the third by his successor, *Xerxes*. They all failed; and, thenceforth, Persia had to content herself with interference, by finance and intrigue, in Greek affairs till Greece was able, by and by, to make her own response.

5. Greece and **Macedon**.—And now, at last, Empire was to emanate from Europe itself, and from the west.

The conquest of the Pelasgians by the Achaeans, and of these by the Dorians, has already been mentioned. Greek history begins with this last event—the descent of the Dorians into the Peloponnese in 1124 B.C.: it continues with their attempt to keep the upper hand. The Dorians—or *Spartans*, as they were soon called, from their chief city—were, like the Prussians of later years, a nation of

¹ Babylon was now under Belsharuzar, or Belshazzar, son of Nabonaid, last of the Babylonian kings and the capture of the city was effected not by "Darius the Mede" of Scripture, but by Cyrus who entered the city by "diverting the river Euphrates." The Bible narrative confuses Cyrus and Darius, placing the last before the first. The confusion may be due to the fact that there were two captures of Babylon: this, by Cyrus (Hdt i 191), and one later, on the revolt of the city, by Darius (Hdt iii 155). [The story of the diversion of the river appears, from Persian inscriptions, to be mythical.]

soldiers; like them, too, they were ruled by a strong, if narrow, oligarchy, and for six centuries they exercised unchallenged a direct control of the Peloponnese, while their authority was vaguely acknowledged by the bundle of "Greek" states further north, united only by a common worship and a common speech

The Persian wars (500–475) gave the first check to Dorian supremacy. The common danger produced some union of the separate elements; it was followed by an outburst of national feeling and patriotic poesy; above all, it led to the emergence of a rival state. To Ionian,¹ naval, democratic *Athens*, even more than to Dorian, military, oligarchic Sparta, the first challenge to Persia, the success of Greece in the struggle itself, the defensive measures which followed, had been mainly due, and, when the danger was past, Athens found herself mistress of a great sea-empire—crowned with the "violet" wreath of her peculiar art. The inevitable duel between the two rival powers, the long "Peloponnesian War" (431–404), in which most of Greece was ranged on one side or the other, ended, largely with the help of Persian gold, in the triumph of *Sparta*; and the cramping yoke of Dorian oligarchy was now really riveted on the neck of the whole of Greece.

But the ancient Spartans—again like the modern Prussians—while they had the military skill to win on the field of battle, had not the human sympathy to govern what they won. City after city revolted; a coalition was formed against the common tyrant; and Sparta had already in self-defence concluded with the Persians a disgraceful

¹ The *Ionians* were probably half Pelasgian, half Achæan; the *Aeolians* were the remnant left in Thessaly by the Achæans when they descended south. So, in historic times, Greece was roughly divided into three: Aeolians, north; Ionians, centre; Dorians, south. And there were three groups of Greek colonies in Asia Minor, corresponding in position to their fellows in Greece itself.

treaty (387), which would have made Greece a province or Persia under Spartan regency: when suddenly she herself was overthrown by a minor state—Aeolian¹ *Thebes* (372–363). Athens had now been crippled by Sparta; Sparta had been broken by Thebes; Thebes was of small account. Greece, disintegrated and without a head, was now gradually, state by state, reduced by Philip, the able ruler of the half Greek kingdom of *Macedon*: to which she became wholly subject after the battle of Chaeronea in 338 B.C.

And now, at last, the Greeks, under Macedonian auspices, were to avenge themselves on Persia for the wrongs they had borne, and to build up, on her ruins, an Empire of their own. In 334 **Alexander the Great**, son of Philip and now King of Macedon, began, in the name of Greece, his great punitive expedition eastward into Persian territory. Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Persia itself—even distant India—all that Persia had held, and more, fell to the conqueror. On his sudden death at Babylon in 323, the Empire he had created broke up into three main kingdoms: *Macedon*, of which Greece itself was still the appanage; *Syria*, which as a rule controlled Asia Minor; and *Egypt*.² But the Greek civilisation he had spread, remained; Alexandria, founded by him in 332, became for a long time the chief centre of Greek literary

¹ See note on previous page

² The rulers of these, and other minor kingdoms, are known as the *Diadochi* or “successors” of Alexander. The throne of Macedonia itself was for some time a subject of contention; but Syria fell at once to Seleucus Nicator, founder of the *Seleucid* dynasty and builder of Antioch, the future capital, and Egypt fell to Ptolemy Soter, who founded the dynasty of the *Ptolemies*, with a capital at Alexandria.—The help given by Macedon to Hannibal in the Second Punic War turned the attention of the Romans eastwards, and resulted in the conquest by Rome, first of Macedon, then of Syria and other provinces (215–146 B.C.), lastly of Egypt, coincident with the establishment of the Roman Empire, in 31 B.C.

life; and all that his "Greek" Empire once included, was, by and by, to form the Eastern half of the Empire of Rome, and, in a way, through Greek art, the conqueror of Rome herself.

The whole thing—to adapt an ancient image—was like a statue, surmounting a pedestal, and led up to by a flight of steps. The steps were the successive Empires—Accadian, Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian—which had preceded; the pedestal was the Greek Empire of Alexander; the statue at the top was Rome.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER II

ROME AND THE CONQUEST OF THE WORLD

A. Rome under the Republic 753-31 B C

Origin of the Romans

- (1) 750-510 B C. : the building of the city
- (2) 510-264 B C. : the reduction of Italy
- (3) 264-201 B.C : the struggle with Carthage
- (4) 201-133 B C. : the conquest of the World (First Phase)
- (5) 133-31 B C. : the conquest of the World (Second Phase Civil Wars).

B. Rome under the Caesars 31 B C.-A D 180

Character and weakness of the Roman Empire danger of Roman army within, of barbarian invasion from without — Five centuries of Empire

- (1) 31 B C -A D 69 . Rome as head of the Empire (Julio-Claudian Emperors).
- (2) A D 69-180 Rise of the Provinces (Flavian Emperors and the Antonines).

C. Decline and Fall of Rome in the West A D 180-476

- (3) A.D. 180-284 Chaos within and invasion from without (Septimius Severus)
- (4) A.D. 284-378 Division of the Empire into East and West (Constantine)
- (5) A D 378-476 . Fall of the Empire in the West (Honorius)

CHAPTER II

ROME AND THE CONQUEST OF THE WORLD

A ROME UNDER THE REPUBLIC 753-31 B C

AND who were these Romans ?

The familiar legend represents them as Phrygians, flying from Troy under one Aeneas . who, after ineffective attempts at settlement in Thrace, Crete, Carthage, landed at length in Italy ; waged a long war with the Latins, Rutulians, Etruscans, and other tribes , and finally married the daughter of the Latin king, making Lavinium, on the coast of Latium, his capital. Ascanius, or Iulus, his son, transferred the seat of government to the more central city of Alba Longa , which, in due course, became the head of a League of Thirty Latin states And from here, in 753 B.C., was founded on the Tiber—Rome

Some of the story does not bear analysis Troy fell in 1184 B.C. ; Carthage was not founded much before 800 B.C. : its introduction, with the whole story of Dido, the Carthaginian queen, is a poetic fiction, foreshadowing the Punic Wars The name "Iulus" is inspired probably by adulation of the "Gens Julia," the family from which the Caesars sprang Other details, such as the early struggle of the Romans with the Etruscans, and the

foundation of Rome from the Latin Alba Longa, may be due to intelligent anticipation of history, or to national pride.

But legend has often a sediment of truth. The Romans, even if they did not come from Troy, were probably of Eastern origin; and the apparent time of their arrival in Italy, circ. 1000 B.C., coincides with the period of unrest in the Aegean Sea. But their early identification with the Latins is no less probable. Similarly, the Etruscans, their great rivals from the first, and their co-partners in the first founding of Rome, even if they did not come from Lydia, their legendary home, certainly came from somewhere East. They formed, apparently, a western and later counterpart of the movement, which had carried the Pelasgians to Palestine arriving in Italy probably after the Romans, and probably by land; fusing, on their way, with a northern tribe, the "Rasena" of the Rhaetian Alps, and, on their arrival, mixing further with the Umbrians in Italy itself.

The story of the foundation of Rome shows the same interweaving of fact and fiction, and the same contention between the Latino-Roman and Umbro-Etruscan elements.

(1) 753-510 B.C. *The Making of Rome*

Rome—*romé*, "strength," or, more probably, *sruma*, the city on the "stream"—began, like David's Cave of Adullum, as an asylum of robbers, founded on a single hill: harrying at first indiscriminately Etruria north of the river, and Latium on the south; but presently identified herself with the latter as an outpost against the former. She was organised from the first as an army; the rape of Sabine women provided the new settlers with wives, Etruria supplied them with law, culture, religion. Control

of the Tiber trade soon assisted material development; and, as later in the case of Austria and Prussia, the adventurous life of a frontier settlement made the little city a vivid nucleus, from which a great empire could be born. With the destruction of Alba Longa, about 650 B.C., Rome became head of the Latin League.

Meanwhile, newcomers had been flocking in, and six more hills were gradually occupied. To the original "Roman" tribe had soon been added a second, the "Sabine"; and to this—after some struggle—a third, the "Etruscan." And, under these three tribes,¹ who together formed the "*Patrician*" citizens, another element had gradually emerged, the "*Plebs*" (= *plēthos*, multitude)—outlanders, living at Rome, but having no civic rights, and ever seeking them. Of the legendary kings—seven in number, like the hills of Rome—the first four were alternately Roman and Sabine; the last three were Etruscan: their rule was despotic, and conceals probably a period of subjugation by Etruria of Rome. It was under the fourth king, a Sabine, that the Plebeians first appear; but the Etruscan despots—as despots would—favoured them still more, and the expulsion of the kings in 510 implied at once release from despotic rule, emergence from Etruscan domination, and a triumph of the old Patrician families over the new Plebeian mob.

It left Rome complete in her seven hills, and nominal mistress of Latium, possessed of a strong army, embellished with noble buildings and civilised laws, and ruled by what was nominally a republic, consisting of a Senate, two "Consuls," and a popular assembly, really an able, if close, aristocratic oligarchy; but troubled within by the

¹ The word "tribus" itself meant "a third": it appears here in its first, original sense.

pressing claims of the Plebs, and—an external form of the same trouble—threatened without by the hostility of Etruria, whose yoke she had just thrown off, and by the jealousy of the Latin and other Italian tribes, from whom the mixed people known as “Romans” had now become distinct.

(2) 510–264 B.C. *The Reduction of Italy*

Italy was at this time inhabited by five races: (1) the *Ligurian* aborigines, in the corners of the land, especially the N.W., (2) the various *Italian* tribes—the Latins in Latium, the Umbro-Sabellians—Samnites and others—round them in the centre; (3) the *Etruscans*, just north of Latium; (4) the *Gauls* north of these again; (5) the *Greeks* of “Magna Graecia” in the extreme south. All these Rome was to conquer in an ever-widening circle of success.

Seven hills; seven kings, and now seven wars. We are still lost in legend. The earlier struggles (510–367) with neighbouring Italian tribes—the *Volscians*, and *Aequians*—and with the *Etruscans* were indecisive, largely owing to difficulty with the Plebeians, who refused to serve in the Roman armies unless their wrongs were redressed. Then in 390 came a terrible invasion by the *Gauls*, who sacked and burnt Rome itself, destroying the city records. And these invasions, like those of the Danes on England, were repeated year by year. But the Gauls, after weakening the Etruscans and Aequians even more than the Romans, were finally driven back, the Plebeian trouble was ultimately settled in 367 by the admission of the Plebs to full Roman rights, and Rome was free to continue her career.

(367-275). First *Latium* was reduced. Then, with the Latins now as her allies, Rome mastered the *Samnites* and other Italian tribes of central Italy: the Etruscans, who had helped the Italians, falling in the same defeat. Lastly, the *Greek* cities in the south, in spite of aid given by Pyrrhus, King of Epirus in Greece itself, succumbed. By 275 all Italy south of the Rubicon was in Roman hands, the Gauls to the north alone remaining unsubdued; and the next few years (275-264) were spent in the consolidation of present gains by military colonies and roads.—Roman Italy now comprised three groups: “Romans,” with full privileges; “Latins,” with half privileges; “Italians”—who were henceforth to swell the victorious armies of Rome—with none.

(3) 264-201 B.C. *The Struggle with Carthage*

In the growth of the Roman Empire one conquest grew ever directly out of another. The last, that over the Greeks in the foot of Italy, brought Rome into contact with the Greeks in the east of Sicily, and this led inevitably to collision with the Carthaginians in the west—with Carthage herself. On the struggle which followed turned the question as to whether an Aryan or an oriental culture was to dominate the Mediterranean, perhaps the European world. The struggle ended, after many vicissitudes, in the triumph of Rome. The *First* “Punic”¹ War (264-241), waged mainly in or about the island, gave Rome her first province, Sicily, and incidentally made her a

¹ “Punic” = Phœnician the race to which the Carthaginians belonged. Rome used, as a model for her first vessels, a Carthaginian war-ship, wrecked on the Italian coast. She constructed four fleets in all during the First Punic War.—In the Second War, a noticeable point, alongside of Hannibal’s brilliant victories at the Ticinus, Trasimene, and Cannae, is his inability to take walled towns. To this, and to the unexpected failure

naval, as well as a military, state; the *Second*, or Hannibalian, War (219–201 B.C.)—the decisive war—beginning in Spain (where Carthage had been busy building an empire since the First), continuing through most of its hazardous course in Italy, ending in Africa, left her practically mistress of Carthage itself, and nominally of Carthaginian Spain.

(4) 201–133 B.C. *The Conquest of the World (First Phase)*

As contact with the Greeks of Italy had led to the struggle with Carthage, so the struggle with Carthage now led to a series of wars with the Greek kingdoms of Alexander to the east—one of which, Macedon, had given, or promised, help to Hannibal in the Second Punic War. The reduction of Macedon and Syria followed in rapid succession, 215–168 B.C.; not long afterwards—in 146 B.C.—Greece, a half-dependency of Macedon, also fell; and the same year, 146, saw the final destruction of Carthage in the “Third Punic War.” Meantime, in the west, successful wars were being carried on against the various Celtic tribes: the long-delayed conquest of the Cisalpine Gauls, who had also assisted Hannibal, was achieved, the Ligurians falling with them, 200–180; and their cousins, the Celts of Spain—the North Province, Lusitania, Numantia—were reduced in turn during the succeeding years, 179–133. By 146 the Mediterranean was virtually, by 133 literally, a Roman lake.

of the Italian cities to rise in his favour, the success of Rome, aided by her own indomitable resolution, was ultimately due. The whole course of the war has been oddly duplicated in recent years by the Great Boer War—especially the versatility and elusiveness of Hannibal himself finds a curious parallel in the resource of the Boer general, de Wet.

(5) 133-31 B.C. *The Conquest of the World (Second Phase)*

At this point a change comes over Roman life. The spoils of the East, the long absence of the peasant-farmer on foreign wars, the contact with Greek culture had destroyed the old simplicity of citizen service, and left in its place luxury, corruption, extremes of wealth and poverty, slave-labour and large estates. In Rome itself the government, the Senate, which since 367 had become gradually composed of ex-magistrates, Patrician or Plebeian, was now a close oligarchy of office, venal, spendthrift, exclusive; the commons had degenerated into an impoverished rabble; between the two had risen a third class, the Equites, or Knights, a new mercantile nobility, still seeking privilege. In the country the "Italians," to whom the conquest of the world was largely due, had returned from the wars to find their farms desolate, and their claims as citizens still unrecognised. In the provinces the conquered inhabitants were ground down by unscrupulous governors, who sought to recoup themselves for extravagance at home by extortion abroad.

On all these questions the State was once more divided into two. The division was no longer between Patrician and Plebeian, but between "Senatorial" and "Popular"; and leading men, from honest conviction or personal ambition, supported the one party or the other—appealing usually to force. The result was a succession of domestic upheavals: beginning in 133, the very year of the final conquest of Spain, with the revolutionary Reforms of the Gracchi; continuing with trouble in Africa raised by the Numidian Jugurtha, Slave Wars in Sicily and Italy, and a "Social" War with the Italians, culminating in a series of great Civil Wars—Marius with Sulla, Caesar with Pompey,

Octavian with Antony—of whom the first in each case represented the Popular, the second the Senatorial cause

Meantime—often interwoven with these internal quarrels—the work of external conquest still went on. To the north a first menace of German invasion—the foretaste of future trouble—was crushed for the time by Marius. To the east, **Pergamus**, already bequeathed by its king to Rome, was settled as the Roman province of “Asia”; **Pontus** was won, first by Sulla, then by Pompey, who had just crushed the **Cilician** pirates and now generally organised the whole of Asia Minor, and Syria as well. To the west, **Gaul**, a new province, where in the S.E. “Provence” had just been Romanised, was wholly won by Caesar, and certain German tribes were beaten back across the Rhine. And finally, to the south, **Egypt**, the last of Alexander’s three “Greek” kingdoms, already half a dependency of Rome, was acquired by Octavian

But throughout these civil and foreign wars, Senatorial government had become more and more discredited, and the power of individual generals—and of their respective armies—had become more and more pronounced: until—with the aid of those same armies—the only possible solution of the difficulty was reached—the substitution of individual for Senatorial rule. Marius, Sulla, Pompey had each in turn been practically absolute; Caesar had been king in all but name; Octavian, Caesar’s adopted son, still avoiding the hated name of “king,” took, under a multitude of titles, Princeps, Consul, Praetor, Pontifex, Imperator, Tribunus and others, the last step towards imperial power.—The victory of Octavian, known presently as “Augustus,” over Antony and the Egyptian Cleopatra at Actium in 31 B.C. not merely added one more province to the Roman world but converted the Roman “Republic”

into the Roman Empire—or “Principate,” as it was called at first.

Rome had now subdued the *Iberians* in various parts of southern Europe. She had mastered the Semitic *Carthaginians* along the north coast of Africa. Of the five Aryan races in Europe, she had almost wholly conquered three: the *Italians* of Italy itself; the *Celts* of Gaul, Spain, and northern Italy; the *Greeks* of the three Alexandrian kingdoms, Macedon, Syria, and Egypt, including Asia Minor and Greece. Her territory was bounded by the three rivers, the Rhine, the Danube, the Euphrates, to the north and east; the Atlantic to the west; the deserts of the Sahara to the south. To these great possessions only two additions—not counting some temporary extensions beyond the Euphrates and the Rhine—were made under the Emperors Celtic Britain, annexed by Claudius in A.D. 41, and Dacia (the modern Roumania and Transylvania), declared a Roman province by Trajan in A.D. 106.

But already Rome had reached the zenith of Empire. Greece had summed up all the empires of the past. Rome covered all that Greece had included, and much more besides; and, like Greece, her empire was crowned by art—the literary glories of the “Augustan Age” an empire, even now co-extensive with civilisation, presently with Christianity—whose empire came into being only a little later than imperial Rome.

B. ROME UNDER THE CAESARS: 31 B.C.—A.D. 180

Rome was now mistress of the world. an “empire,” not merely in form of government, but also in extent of territory. But already, in both regards, the signs of coming trouble could be seen. Only by A.D. 300

did Teuton invaders begin pouring over her boundaries ; but chaos and the decline of her power began even before that—after A.D. 180 ; the Teuton peril hung like a cloud over the horizon from the time of the establishment of the Empire itself in 31 B.C.—even before. We have heard the first grumbling of the storm in the times of the Republic, when Marius defeated the invading “Cimbri”¹ and Teutons in 102–101 B.C. ; Julius Caesar had faced the same danger a second time, when in 58 B.C. he drove back the German Ariovistus from Gaul across the Rhine ; and now Augustus himself, at the very outset of the Empire, realised, for the third time, this Teuton peril, when he mourned the annihilation of his legions by the German Arminius or Hermann, in A.D. 9. And the danger grew more and more, as the history of the Empire proceeded on its course.

But the Empire suffered not merely from this Teuton peril from without. It suffered also, from the beginning, from its own character within. In the first place, it included a multitude of heterogeneous peoples, of whom the Greek or eastern half especially were never wholly romanised “*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit,*” and oriental influence more and more affected Roman life. Secondly, it was honeycombed throughout by the luxury, licence, and corruption which the last days of the Republic had left behind as an inheritance, and which similarly increased as time went on. Thirdly, and mostly, it was really a military despotism, with all the weaknesses of this. The old forms of the Republic, with its senate, consuls, etc., were still retained, and the new ruler was known to the Romans mainly as “*Princeps,*” prince or leader of the

¹ The Cimbri seem to have lived in Denmark, named after them the “Cimbrie Chersonese.” It is not clear if they were Celts or Teutons.

Senate, or as “Caesar” from his adoptive family, or as “Augustus,” a personal title of respect: it was not long before the adulatory name of “deus” was conferred on the Emperor at his death. But the modern term of “Emperor” itself—*Imperator*, commander of the army—more truly represents his character. By the army the Empire had been created; on the army it continued to depend, and the army became more and more its master rather than its slave.

The Roman Empire, if we reckon its duration from the Battle of Actium in 31 B.C. to the fall of Rome itself in A.D. 476, lasted five centuries: of which each century presented roughly a separate character—though in each we may also see foreshadowed the characteristics of the next.

(1) 31 B.C.—A.D. 69. Rome as head of the Empire
(Julio-Claudian Emperors)

The first period showed the signs of all the troubles that were to come. Augustus himself lost, as we have mentioned, ten Roman legions to Germans upon the Rhine he further left as a legacy to future Emperors his “Praetorian Guards.” *Tiberius*, an Eastern despot in all his ways, riveted the army yoke still more strongly by billeting the Praetorians in Rome; and introduced the disgraceful system of “delatores,” spies. *Caligula*, a madman, was murdered by the Praetorian Guards. *Claudius*, “Father of the Provinces,” besides annexing Britain, bestowed the citizenship on many Gauls; and marked, by his subservience to “Freedmen” (slaves who were freed) and women, the beginning of harem influence at court: his fourth wife poisoned him. *Nero*, murderer of his wife and mother, first persecutor of the Christians, suspected incendiary of

Rome, and author of an "Iliad," died, amid a turmoil of revolt and conspiracy, by his own hand. The last three Emperors, *Galba*, *Otho*, and *Vitellius*, were elected or overthrown by the Praetorian or other armies in one year.

Seven out of the eight Emperors—all except Augustus himself—met a violent end, five of them by the action of troops; and the period ends in chaos, with the Praetorians masters of the situation. But Rome was still the centre of government, imperial elections, if decided by the army, were still nominally confirmed by the Roman Senate; and the Emperor himself was still of Roman birth.

(2) A.D. 69–180. Rise of the Provinces (Flavian Emperors, and the Antonines)

From the indignity of the last period Rome was re-deemed by Flavius *Vespasianus* and his son *Titus*, captor of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 during his father's reign. There was a temporary lapse during the reign of his other son, the cruel *Domitian*, author of the second Christian persecution. Then began what is known in history as the "Age of the Antonines." Order was restored in Rome itself under *Nerva*, by the total suppression of the "delatores," and a partial subjection of the Praetorian Guards. *Trajan*, a Spaniard, the first warlike Emperor, inaugurated a new era by taking offensive measures against the barbarian invaders, and forming a new province, Dacia, north of the Danube, as a military outpost. With him, too, began the system of Emperors succeeding by adoption, not heredity. As Trajan was the first to take external defence strongly in hand, so *Hadrian*, his adopted successor, was the first to make a business of internal organisation. It was by him that the great wall was built across northern Britain,

his systematic tour of the Provinces makes him one of the most useful emperors ; and *Antoninus Pius*, a Gaul, whom he chose to follow him, succeeded to a secure and peaceful throne

But the gain to the Empire as a whole was at the expense of Rome. *Vespasian*, first of the *Flavians*, had been acclaimed by the troops at *Alexandria*, two of the *Antonines*, *Trajan* and *Antoninus Pius*, were of non-Roman birth ; and the Provinces, with the provincial armies, assumed an ever greater importance. What is even more significant, those armies were now steadily recruited from foreign tribes. The “Age of the *Antonines*” has been accounted the happiest in the history of the world, the happiness reached its climax under the successor of *Antoninus Pius*, the noble *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*, soldier and stoic philosopher, author of the famous “*Meditations*” ; and to him might well have been addressed the line, “*urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat*” (thou hast made a city what was once a world).

But with the death of *Aurelius*—he fell fighting against a German tribe in *Pannonia*—the last of the great Pagan Caesars passed away ; and even the good that had been done prepared the road for the evil which was to follow.

C. DECLINE AND FALL OF ROME : A.D. 180–476

(3) A.D. 180–284. Chaos within and invasion from without

The evil was not long in coming, and in the reign of *Commodus*, *Aurelius*’s own son and successor, the Empire touched its lowest depth. But the great change came with the accession of *Septimius Severus* (193–211) This

Emperor increased the power of the Praetorian Guards by adding large numbers of foreigners and making their Prefect the chief man in Rome; he laid the Empire open to invasion by dismantling Byzantium; and at his death he anticipated future times by dividing the imperial power between two sons. His reign may be considered a main landmark in the whole "decline."

From this time onward the Emperor was regularly declared not merely by the guards in Rome, but also by the armies in the Provinces. The servant had now definitely become the master. In the time of the *Gordians* there were four Emperors, thus declared, at once; in the reign of *Philip*, as many as nineteen, known as the "Thirty Tyrants" One Emperor, the giant and brutal *Maximin*, was a Goth, another, Philip himself, was an Arab; and the last Emperors of the period were Illyrian-born. The Empire was beginning also to take an oriental cast—especially, under the effeminate *Elagabalus*, "High-Priest of the Sun," women ruled the court, and the seat of government was at Antioch rather than at Rome—Meanwhile, the German enemies of Rome had not been slow to take advantage of the chaos, and under *Decius*—a noble ruler, whose severe persecution of the Christians was dictated by desire to preserve the vanishing ideals of the old Roman life—began that great final insistence of the German menace, which was to end in the fall of Rome.

At the beginning of this disastrous period, by an irony, was passed the famous "Edict of Caracalla," which, though passed only to extend the sphere of taxation, bestowed the Roman citizenship on every one within the Empire; in the middle—the height of chaos under Philip, A.D. 248—by an equal irony, were celebrated the "Secular Games," in honour of the 1000th anniversary of Rome. The end of

the period marks some recovery at home and abroad under the Illyrian Emperors. But how intimate the barbarian peril had become is shown by the fact that one of these Emperors, *Aurelian*, thought it advisable to refortify the walls of Rome itself; and it had become obvious that the unwieldy, tottering Empire could—as Severus, with all his failings, had foreseen—be saved only by divided rule.

(4) A.D. 284-378. The division of the Empire into
East and West

It was no less obvious what form the division ought to take. The East had never been wholly Romanised, the problem of German invasion had become especially insistent here; and, of late, a definite orientation of the whole Empire had begun. *Diocletian* (284-305) made the first move, taking to himself the East, as the more important, and fixing his capital at Nicomedia, with the object of watching the barbarian peril, his colleague in the West, with the same object, placed his seat of government no longer at Rome, but at Milan, further north; the Senate, deprived of all connexion with the imperial court, was left a useless institution on the Capitol. These two bore the title of “Augusti”; and, under them, controlling respectively Britain, Gaul, and Spain, and the Danubian provinces, were two “Caesars,” who were to become “Augusti” in their turn; thus preserving continuity of rule.

Constantine (324-339), son of *Constantius*, the “Caesar” of Britain, made the next move. Beginning, in a period of anarchy, as one of six rival Emperors, he gradually gathered West and East into his own unscrupulous hands; but he did two things which, more than anything else, were to emphasise the growing difference between East

and West and to make the first a separate entity. He founded a new capital, Constantinople, on the site of Byzantium, in 330, and he adopted a new religion, which had now survived many persecutions, Christianity. Born, so it was said, of a Christian mother, the famous St Helena, he celebrated his first great success¹ by issuing in 313 the "Edict of Milan," by which toleration of the Christians was proclaimed; on a second success, the one by which he became sole Emperor in 324, Christianity was made the favoured religion of the Roman Empire; and, on his death-bed in 337, he himself—though a man of little morality and no creeds at all—was baptised by a bishop of the Arian² faith. This recognition of Christianity—essentially the religion of the East—even more than the foundation of Constantinople, set a seal to the severance of East from West, marked the beginning of a new era in history, and was destined to have far-reaching consequences in later times.

The final move, after another interlude of unrest both in the political and the religious spheres, came with the accession of *Valentinian*: who, in 364, gave the charge of

¹ This was over his rival, Maxentius, at the Battle of the Milvian Bridge in 312. On the night before the battle, Constantine was said to have seen in the clouds the emblem of the cross, with the legend below it, "hoc signo vinces" (with this as thy standard thou wilt conquer). The emblem, in the form of the "Labarum," was to serve as the sign of future rulers of Constantinople. The Edict of Milan was destined to play an even more important part: on it—or on the legends which attached to it—were largely based the pretensions of the Popes and the conception of the Holy Roman Empire in after years.

² The "Arians" were so called from one Arius, an Alexandrian theologian (256–336), who denied the doctrine of the Trinity. The question was discussed at a council—the first "Oecumenical" or general council of the Christian Church—summoned by Constantine at Nicaea in 325 when Arius was held to be defeated, and the "Nicene Creed" was formulated by his opponent, St Athanasius—a name recorded also in the "Athanasian Creed" (Distinguish "Arian," the faith, and "Aryan," the race: the two words have no connexion.)

the East to his brother *Valens*, retaining for himself the West. After this, East and West, though nominally reunited for a while from time to time, formed two distinct administrative areas.

(5) A D. 378-476. The Fall of the Empire in the West

The division of the Empire into East and West proved successful for a time in its main object—the check of the German menace: but it was successful only for the time. That menace had hung like a cloud over the horizon from the very beginnings of the Empire. In earlier years the chief pressure had been on the Rhine; but, of late, the Danube had rather been the threatened sphere, and here, century by century, the peril had become more imminent—with periodic checks from time to time.

The first stage of the great pressure is marked by the reign of *Decius* (249-251), who had himself fallen fighting against the Goths in Moesia. After this, a brief respite had been won by the Illyrian Emperors. A second stage is marked, in the reign of *Valens*—soon after the division of the Empire—by the fatal permission given to the Visigoths (the Goths were now in three great tribes), hard pressed by the Huns and Ostrogoths, to leave Dacia, cross the Danube, and settle in Moesia: where Valens himself was killed at Adrianople in battle with the barbarians. And now, once more, the German hordes were hurled back by the successor of Valens, Theodosius I. (378-395), a Spaniard, who in the last years of his efficient reign was Emperor both in East and West. But under his two sons, *Arcadius*, Emperor in the East (395-408), and *Honorius*, Emperor in the West (395-423), came the last and fatal stage, when the German invaders began to pour

in on every side, by Danube, Rhine, and sea. In 410 the Roman legions, already partially withdrawn from Britain, were finally recalled to meet the more instant peril nearer home

Meanwhile, in Italy itself, a kind of "peaceful penetration" had been going on. The Roman armies had long been recruited with Germans—Franks, Vandals, Goths: even Theodosius I. had added many of the last. With the accession of his sons the penetration assumed a more intimate and personal form. Placidia, sister of Honorius, was married to a Gothic king; *Stilicho*, a Vandal, *Theodoric*, a Goth,¹ *Ricimer*, a Suevian, in turn controlled the affairs of Empire, deposed or appointed Emperors, even tried at times to beat off barbarian hordes: until at last a barbarian, after a succession of feeble Roman reigns, himself assumed the power, though not the title, of Emperor. In A.D. 476, Romulus Augustulus, last Roman Emperor in the West, Emperor now only in name, resigned to one *Odoacer*, a German of the Herulian tribe; Italy was under a barbarian ruler; and the Empire in the West was, for all practical purposes, at an end.

¹ This Theodoric was King of the *Visigoths*, and helped the Romans to defeat Attila at Chalons in 451. He must not be confused with Theodoric the Great, King of the *Ostrogoths*, who overthrew Odoacer and mastered Italy in 489-490: see *inf.* pp. 56-57.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER III

OVERTHROW OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE BY THE BARBARIANS

A. The Western Provinces and their Teuton Conquerors circ. A.D. 300-550.

Movement started by Huns, and continued by them. but Teutons the main agents, in the overthrow of Rome, A.D. 300-568

(a) *Teutons on Danube* (Italy and Spain) :

1. *Visigoths*, through Italy to Gaul and Spain 395-414
2. *Vandals* (with Slavs), through Italy, to Spain and Carthage 406-439
3. *Gepidae* (with Huns) on Italy, 450. (Odoacer, ruler of Italy, 476)
4. *Ostrogoths* conquer Italy, 489-559, overthrowing Odoacer overthrown by Justinian.
5. *Lombards* conquer Italy, 568.

(b) *Teutons on Rhine* (Gaul) :

1. *Alemanni*, N E Gaul, circ 350
2. *Burgundians*, N E Gaul, 371 then S E Gaul, 406.
3. *Franks*, N E Gaul, 350 : master the whole, 481-511

(c) *Teutons by Sea* (Britain) :

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Jutes</i>, S.E. Britain 2. <i>Angles</i>, N E Britain 3. <i>Saxons</i>, S Britain | $\left. \vphantom{\begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{matrix}} \right\} \cdot \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{begin invasions, circ 300 ;} \\ \text{conquer Britain, 449-597 ;} \\ \text{converted to Christianity, 597-664} \end{array} \right.$ |
|---|--|

Results - Visigoths in *Spain*, Franks in *Gaul*, Anglo-Saxons in *Britain*, Lombards in *Italy*

B. The Eastern Provinces and the Slavs, Saracens, etc. circ. 550-1050.

Barbarian invasions, taken as a whole, conveniently divisible into five periods of 250 years each.

[(1) Circ 300-550 - Teutons by Danube, Rhine, and sea - concern mainly Western Empire. (This already dealt with)]

(2) Circ 550-800 : *Slavs, Avars, Saracens curtail Eastern Empire on West, North, East, South.*

1. *Slavs*. (a) North: 1 Wends, Poles; 2. Czechs (Bohemia),
3 Russians
(b) South: 1 Croats, 2 Bulgarians (half-Hun),
3 Serbs.

2 *Avars* conquer Hungary circ. 600 dividing northern and southern Slavs.

3. *Saracens* conquer (a) in Asia: Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, half Asia Minor, (b) in Africa. Egypt, Kairouan, Morocco, (c) in Europe: Spain (and, later, Sicily, S Italy)

Divide into (1) Ommiad Caliphate, Cordova, (2) Abbaside Caliphate, Baghdad, (3) Fatimite Caliphate, Cairo; also (4) Kairouan; (5) Mekims (Morocco).

(3) Circ. 800-1050. *Magyars, Danes, Norse (affecting mainly Teutonic Conquerors of the West)*

1. *Magyars* conquer Hungary 896-996: menace to Teutons on West, but bulwark v Turks on East
2. *Danes* invade England, 789, 871, 980. conquer it, 1014-1066
3. *Norse* (a) 789-862 sea-raids on England, Gaul, Russia;
(b) 862-1003: conquer "Russia," 862; seize Normandy, 912, (c) 1003-1100 Normans conquer England, 1066; S Italy, 1058-1131 ("Two Sicilies").

C *Final Fall of the Roman Empire in the East* circ 1050-1550

(4) Circ 1050-1300 : *Turks resume thread of Saracen conquests and become Mahomedan.*

1. *Seljuk Turks* (a) 1058-1092, "Kingdom of Roum"; (b) 1092-1145, five sultanates, (c) 1145-1174, Atabeks of Aleppo; (d) 1174-1215, Saladin, (e) 1215, Mamelukes
2. *Crusades*, 1096-1272: "Latin Empire" of Constantinople, 1204-1261
3. *Mongols*, First Invasion. Zenghis Khan, 1206 Conquer Russia, 1233.

(5) Circ 1300-1550 : *resumption of Turkish conquest and final overthrow of Constantinople*

- 1 *Ottoman Turks* 1299-1402: take Brusa in Asia, Adrianople in Europe
- 2 *Ottoman Turks* checked by Second Invasion of *Mongols* under Tamerlane, 1402
3. *Ottoman Turks* take Constantinople, 1453—Height of power under Soliman, 1550

Meantime, while the Eastern Empire has been falling, the Teutons dream of reviving the Empire in the West.

CHAPTER III

OVERTHROW OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE BY THE BARBARIANS

A. THE WESTERN EMPIRE AND ITS TEUTON CONQUERORS : CIRC. 300-550 A.D.

THE fall of the Roman Empire is commonly dated as occurring in A.D. 476, when Odoacer, the first barbarian ruler of Italy, began his rule in Rome. But its fall even in the west had begun long before: and it continued long afterwards. The whole process may be reckoned as covering roughly 250 years · 300-550.

The Huns—not a Teuton, but a Turanian people, in spite of the recent usage of their name—had indirectly caused the final crash, and the Huns were also responsible for one of the biggest barbarian invasions of Italy and Gaul. But the Huns began by supplying only a first motive power; the Huns, though they pointed the way to other Turanian invaders, themselves ended by forming only a passing episode in the whole catastrophe. They did not even, as is sometimes supposed, leave their name to Hungary; which is so called from the “Ugrians” or “Ungrians,” another branch of the great Turanian family, to which the later, Magyar conquerors belonged.¹ It was

¹ The only survivors of Attila's Huns are the “Bulgarians”; and even they, in race, are more Slav than Hun. The Huns, after the death of Attila in 453, fell back on the Volga,* where for two centuries they

by Teutons, and by Teutons only, that the Roman Empire in the west was overcome.

Of this great Teuton menace the Roman Empire, throughout the 500 years of its existence, was in constant fear along all its boundaries. Forts were erected in Gaul along the *Rhine* to hold Teutons—the Franks—in check, “counts of the shore” were appointed in Britain to prevent the raids of Teutons—the Saxons and Norse—by sea; it was largely to dominate Teutons—the Goths—on the *Danube* that Constantinople had been founded and the Empire had been divided into two. These measures did not save the situation, so far as the Western half of the Empire was concerned. On all three frontiers—the Danube, the Rhine, the sea—Teutons continued pressing. It was on the Rhine that the trouble, in its earlier phases, had begun; it was by sea that the ruin was to be completed: but it was on the Danube that the great movement, which had been gathering force so long, first fatally broke through.

Here, along the north of the river, a huge congeries of Teutons, Slavs, Huns had been gradually collecting, ready to pour down over the devoted countries to the south. The Teuton Goths,¹ divided now into three groups, the *Visi-*

remained, with Bulgari as their capital. About 650—the date of the great Slav movements to the south—they also moved southward with a horde of Croats and other Slavs, and founded “Bulgaria,” so-named from their old capital of Bulgari.

¹ The Goths, a people connected with the Suevi, from whom the Baltic was once called the “Mare Suevicum,” sprang, according to the legend, from Scandinavia: where “Gothaland” in Sweden still records their name. The Gepidae or “Laggards” were so called because they were the last of the Goths to cross the Baltic Sea. In Dacia the Goths seem to have become confused in name and race with the Getae, a Turanian tribe. On the connexion of the Suevi with the Alemanni, see below, Invasions by the Rhine—Before their downward movement, the Goths were converted to Arian Christianity by the Gothic bishop, Ulphilas. Here too the first step was taken by the Visigoths.

goths or West Goths, the *Ostrogoths* or East Goths, and the *Gepidae*, made the first downward movement. The Visigoths led the way

(a) Teutons on the Danube: Goths, Vandals,
Lombards

1. The Visigoths, hard pressed by the Ostrogoths and Huns, had already, since about 300, been working their way over the Danube. We have mentioned, above, the fatal mistake made by Valens in 376—just a century before the fall of Rome—in allowing them definitely to cross the river and settle in Moesia to the south. From here began the great movement, which was to be the pioneer of all movements of the Teuton hordes. In 395, under *Alaric*, their famous king, they swept over Macedonia and Greece; presently twice invaded Italy; and in spite of a defeat inflicted at Pollentia, 403, by the Vandal Stilicho, general of Honorius, sacked Rome in 410. At this point Alaric himself died in South Italy; a stream, the little river Crathus, was diverted to preserve in its bed, inviolate for ever, the body of the mighty king. In 414-415 the Visigoths, following the steps of the Vandals and Suevi, who had meantime preceded them, and partly absorbing their conquests, moved on westward and mastered most of Gaul and Spain.—It is from the Visigoths that the modern monarchy of Spain derives.

2. The Vandals came next. (a) In 406, under one *Radagaisus*, they burst over the Danube with a horde of Suevi, Burgundians, and others, into Italy, laid siege to Florence, and threatened Rome itself. (b) From this new terror, with which the name "Vandalism" has been justly associated, Rome was saved once more by Stilicho; and

in the winter of the same year, 406, the invaders, driven from Italy, made their way to Gaul. Leaving the Burgundians behind them here, the Vandals, with the Suevi, moved on, in 409, to Spain: where the Suevi settled in the N.W., while the Vandals founded the Kingdom of Andalusia, or Vandalusia, in the south. (c) Lastly, the Spanish Vandals, under their wicked little King, the lame and cruel Genseric, crossing in 429 to Africa, conquered Carthage in 439, presently ravaged Sicily, and, by and by, passed over to Italy itself. Rome, already sacked by the Visigoth Alaric in 410, had meanwhile been threatened a second time by Attila, the Hun, in 452: it was now pillaged once more—despite the brave intervention of Pope Leo I—by the Vandal Genseric, in 455.

3. The **Gepidae**.—Meanwhile, the **Huns**¹ themselves, first cause of all the trouble, were busy launching an invasion of their own. A Turanian people, like the Scythians of old, and, like them, a nation of horsemen; hideous, with flat Tartar noses and broad nostrils, which they made flatter and broader by artificial means, they were already a growing terror, when under *Attila*, a swarth, squat Calmuck, “the Scourge of God,” their barbaric empire extended along the North from the Volga almost to the Rhine, included many Teuton and Slavonic tribes, and developed no less an objective than the Empire of the World. The Eastern provinces, then under Theodosius II., were overrun (441–450) the turn of

¹ The Huns had long been a terror to Eastern Asia it was against them that the “Great Wall” of China was built circ 300 B.C. About 100 A.D. they began to move westward toward the Caspian. Here they divided, one contingent moving south to Turkestan, the other—assailants of Rome—continuing west to the Volga. It was by these last, under Attila, that the assault on Italy was made, and the corruption of Tatar, their racial name, to Tartar, or “Hell,” records the effect of their advent on the Roman mind

the West was now to come (450-453); and the claim to universal Empire was preluded by a demand of the Roman princess, Honoria, sister of Valentinian III., who then ruled the West, in marriage to this Mongolian ghoul. In 451 his motley host of Huns, Gepidae, Ostrogoths and others, on the invitation of a Frankish faction, poured into Gaul. A great defeat by a combined army of Romans, Franks, and Visigoths at *Chalons*—a fight so fierce that, long after, the spirits of the slain nightly renewed the ghostly combat over the battlefield—did not prevent Attila from marching on Italy in 452, in nominal pursuance of his marriage-claim. It was now that Venice was founded by refugees from Aquileia, flying before the terror of the Huns. Padua and Verona were laid in ashes; Milan and Pavia submitted to be despoiled; Rome itself was only saved from this, or the other, fate by a deputation headed by Leo I. in all his Papal robes. Attila withdrew across the Danube, threatening to return. But in 453 he died suddenly on the night of his marriage with another bride: and the proud monarch, whose boast it had been that the grass never grew where his horse's hooves had trod, was buried in three coffins of gold, silver, and lead, among the mountains of Hungary, and "the place of his sepulture no man knoweth to this day." After his death the Huns fell back to the Volga; the Gepidae retired to Dacia; other Teutons remained on the Danube—Odoacer, the Herulian, son of Attila's favourite Teuton general and first barbarian ruler of Rome in 476, was one of these.

4. The **Ostrogoths**.—Odoacer's triumph was short-lived. In 476, the year of his accession to power, *Theodoric the Great* became King of the Ostrogoths, and under him this people, who, with the Huns, had caused the first move-

ment of the Visigoths and, like the other Gothic tribe, the Gepidae, had taken part in the recent invasion of the Huns, presently, at the suggestion of the Eastern Emperor, themselves, in their turn, moved down on Italy. Odoacer was defeated in three battles, 489–490, and was subsequently killed by the conqueror: who soon became practically independent of the Eastern court, for which he had acted. He styled himself “King of Italy”—the first time that title had been used; and made Ravenna, the capital of the later Caesars, his seat of government. Theodoric, by his wise and peaceful rule, belied the name of “Goth.” At home, he fostered literature and art; abroad, he made domestic alliance with Franks, Visigoths, and other new Teuton powers; and, for a short while, practically included under his authority the Visigoths of Gaul and Spain—almost reuniting the old Western provinces of Rome under Teuton rule.

But the time for this reunion was yet to come. Ostrogoth and Italian, even during the life of Theodoric, never really fused in Italy; on his death in 526, the two Gothic kingdoms became separate again, and in 540–553 the power he had founded was overthrown by the Eastern Emperor. *Justinian*, Emperor of the East, 527–565, famous also through all time for his codification of Roman Law, destroyed the Vandal kingdom in Africa, beat back the Persians on the Euphrates, and crushed the Ostrogoths of Italy, where, in 553, he established what was presently known as the Greek “Exarchate of Ravenna,” making Italy once more a province of Byzantium. It looked for a moment as if the Western provinces might be recovered, under Eastern auspices, from Teuton hands. But Justinian himself had already prepared the way for one more Teuton invasion, which followed immediately on

his death, and was destined to undo the work he had begun.

5 The **Lombards** or *Langobardi*¹—last of the Teuton invaders, and fiercest of them all—had been invited by Justinian about 530 to cross the Danube and check the menace of the Gepidae, who had long troubled the Byzantine realm. A war of thirty years followed between the two Teuton tribes, in which the terrible Gepidae were successful, and the Lombards found themselves in danger of extermination. It was at this point that Justinian, the Greek Emperor, died, and the famous *Alboin* succeeded to the Lombard throne. In 566 the new King bought the help of the Avars, a Turanian people driven westward from the Urals by the Turks; and together the two tribes annihilated the Gepidae, and slew their King. The skull of the dead monarch Alboin used as a drinking-bowl; his daughter, the fair Rosamond, he took to wife. Leaving to the Avars the lands of the Gepidae in Dacia, Alboin crossed the Alps; overran the fertile plain still known as Lombardy; and there, in 568, was raised on a shield as “King of Italy.” Shortly afterwards, he was murdered by his wife’s agency but the Kingdom he had founded in the north, with Milan as capital, was increased presently by the creation of the Lombard Duchies of Spoleto and Benevento to the south, and lasted for two hundred years.

Nearly all these Teutons, in the process of their conquest—sometimes before—were converted to Christianity, chiefly of the Arian form²

¹ Their name has been variously interpreted as “Long Beards” and “Long Spears”—but means probably “along the Border,” viz of the River Elbe, from which this people came

² On Arian Christianity, see *sup* p 46, note.

(b) Teutons on the Rhine: Alemanni, Burgúndians,
Franks

While these movements on the Danube had been going on, other movements, sometimes intertwined with them, had been declaring themselves once more upon the Rhine, the original scene of trouble. The Danube movements had ended by affecting mainly Italy and Spain; the Rhine movements are chiefly concerned with France. Three Teuton tribes, the Alemanni, Burgundians, and Franks, all rivals of one another, took part in them.

1. The **Alemanni**,¹ or "All men," were the first to move. Indeed, as early as 250, they had, by crossing the Rhine into Gaul and the Danube into Italy, been the first to reveal, on two boundaries, the weakness of the Roman Empire. But the main Rhine movement occurred about 350: when the Alemanni and their lifelong enemies the Franks were invited by Constantius, son of Constantine, to cross the river into northern Gaul. The Alemanni now got definitely astride the Rhine in Alsace and Lorraine; where the disputed possession of certain salt-pits involved them in war also with the Burgundians, who were still in Germany.

2 The **Burgundians** failed at this time (350) to obtain a foothold in Gaul. Their passage of the Rhine was destined to take place at a later date, and further to the south. In 406, as has been mentioned, they took part in the Vandal migration over the Danube into Italy; and, after the defeat of the Confederates near Florence, moved westward with their allies across the Rhine. But, while

¹ The Alemanni are almost indistinguishable from the Suevi, and had already taken part in the Danube movements which ended in the Suevic settlement in Spain.—See *sup.* on the Vandals, p. 54.

the Vandals and Suevi passed on to Spain, the Burgundians remained in Gaul, and here, on the banks of the Rhone, with Lyons as their capital, they founded the famous Dukedom, which presently included Switzerland ; later, as the "Kingdom of Arles," spread far up northward , at one time included Flanders ; and always remained a menace to the monarchy of France.¹

3, The Franks. But it was from another tribe that the French monarchy was to be derived The Franks, or "Free-men,"² like the Alemanni, first entered Gaul about 250 ; and, like them, got their foothold there about 350, in a second movement, when they established themselves in Batavia. Either now or previously they had divided into two branches : the *Salian* Franks, living on the Sala, near the mouths of the Rhine, with Tournai as their capital, and the *Ripuarian* Franks, dwelling on the banks, "ripae," of the river, a little further south It is to the former that the third great movement, beginning about 450, was due. In 481 *Cloms* (Clodwig, Ludwig, or Louis), of the Merovingian dynasty, became their king His first victory, achieved in 486 at *Soissons* over the Romans themselves under one Syagrius, who had revolted from Odoacer's rule, signalled the coming Frankish mastery of Gaul It was followed in rapid succession by victories over the Ripuarian Franks, the Alemanni, the Burgundians, the Visigoths ; the Frankish capital was transferred from Tournai to Soissons, from Soissons to Paris, and before

¹ The name Burgundy is very confusing As a "Kingdom," a "Duchy," a "Free Country" (Franche-Comté), it covers in history ten different districts of varying status and extent (see Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, Appendix, Note A).—The country was finally absorbed into France, partly about 1480, by Louis XI, partly about 1680, by Louis XIV.

² Another suggested derivation is from *francisca* a single-edged missile "axe," used by these tall warriors in battle With which compare the supposed origin of Lombard from a word meaning "spear."

the end of his thirty years of reign in 511, the whole country was roughly under Frankish rule—From the Franks, German in origin, but gradually fused with the Celto-Roman elements in Gaul, comes the modern name of “France”; while “Allemagne,” the French word for Germany, records the old antagonism with the Alemanni, which has lasted to the present day.

But the important event in the reign of Clovis was his conversion to Christianity. This occurred, as with Constantine, in the hour and as the price of victory—the great victory of the Franks over the Alemanni, their national enemy, at *Tolbiac*, in 496: when the Franks became at once full Catholic—a fact which was destined to have much bearing on the future history not merely of France itself but of the European world.

(c) Teutons by Sea: the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons

Both these movements, on Danube and on Rhine, had, directly and indirectly, prepared the way for a third set of movements—those by sea: affecting Britain. The unrest on the Rhine had already, as early as 300, set in motion the Saxons, Angles, and Jutes: Teuton tribes living just north of the Franks. The withdrawal of the Roman legions from Britain in 410 owing to the Danube menace exposed the island to definite attack. And here, as often elsewhere, the beginnings of barbarian settlement were due to invitation.

In 449 *Vortigern*, the Celtic King of Kent, hard pressed by the northern Celts, the Picts and Scots, appealed to the Jutes for help. The Jutes, under their chieftains, *Hengist* and *Horsa*, occupied the country they had been asked to aid—the S.E. corner of the island, Angles and

Saxons followed—the Angles landing along the N, the Saxons along the S., driving the Celts¹ between them to the western coast; and, in the course of 150 years, 449-597, the whole of central and eastern Britain fell under Teuton occupation. The conversion of the Anglo-Saxons succeeded, 597-664. And in this also Kent led the way hence the primæ position of the Archbishopric of Canterbury.

At first the newcomers were in separate tribes. After a time they fused into seven chief kingdoms—a “Heptarchy”: the *Jutes* in Kent; the *Saxons* in Essex, Sussex, Wessex; the *Angles* in Northumbria, East Anglia, and Mercia. Lastly, three of these obtained supremacy in turn: Northumbria, Mercia, Wessex. “England” takes its name from the Angles; but it is from *Wessex*, the kingdom of the “West Saxons,” and from Alfred the Great, their king (871-901), that the English monarchy derives its origin.

Results of Teuton Conquests in Western Empire

This period, 300-568, in which the Western Empire of Rome was overrun by German hordes on Danube, Rhine, and sea, is known to the Germans themselves as the period of “Folk-wanderings.” At the end of it, not counting the German tribes who still remained in *Germany* itself, *Britain* was occupied by Anglo-Saxons; *France* by the Franks; *Spain* by the Visigoths, *Italy* by the Lombards, except such portions of it as, under the name of the “Exarchate of Ravenna,” were claimed by the Eastern Empire.—With this last exception the whole of the Roman domination of the West was now in German hands.

¹ Chiefly Cornwall and Wales. Some of these Celts, Brythons, now fled back across the Channel to their old Celtic home in Gaul where “Brittany” still retains their name. See *sup* p 12, note.

Later on, circ. 1050, other Teuton peoples, the Normans, were to seize Sicily and southern Italy. But it is with the Lombard invasion of 568 that the period of German "Folk-wandering" concludes an invasion which marks an epoch in the history of the West and the beginning of a new development for Rome.

B. THE EASTERN EMPIRE AND THE SLAVS, SARACENS, ETC. : CIRC. A.D. 550-1050

If the Roman Empire survived the fall of Rome in Western Europe nearly a century, the survival of Empire in the East was longer still. Though the barbarian invasions threatened the Eastern Empire at first even more than the Empire of the West, Constantinople itself survived Rome by almost a thousand years.

These invasions, geographically and in character, fall altogether under three main heads:—*A. The Teuton invasions of Western Europe*, those of Goths, Franks, Anglo-Saxons, Lombards, followed later by a second phase of Teuton aggression, the inroads of their Scandinavian brethren, the Norse; *B The Slav descents on Central Europe*, those of the Wends, Serbs, Bulgarians on Hungary, North Greece, and Germany itself, attended by, and often mixed up with, the first phase of Turanian invasions—those of the Huns, Avars, and Magyars; *C. The great Mahommedan inundation from the East*, begun by the Semitic Saracens, and continued by a second phase of Turanian enterprise, that of the Mongols and the Turks. In point of time they fall roughly into five periods, each consisting roughly of 250 years:

- (1) Circ. 300-550: Teutons by Danube, Rhine, and sea.
- (2) Circ. 550-800: Slavs, Avars, Saracens.

(3) Circ. 800-1050 . Magyars, Danes, Norse.

(4) Circ 1050-1300 . Seljuk Turks and Mongols.

(5) Circ. 1300-1550 : Ottoman Turks.

Of these, “(1) circ. 300-550: Teutons by Danube, Rhine, and sea,” concerns mainly the Western Empire and its overthrow by the Teuton conquerors—the period already dealt with above . The other four, while often threatening the Teuton conquerors themselves, bear mainly on the Empire of the East.

(2) Circ. 550-800 ; Slavs, Avars, Saracens

1. The Slavs had already taken part in the invasions of the Vandals and the Huns . they now continued with movements of their own (600-800), pressing as usual on the heels of the Teutons. In the north, *Wends* (Venedae), *Letts*, and “*Poles*”¹ moved westward towards the Elbe ; the *Czechs* and *Slovaks*, S.W. into Bohemia, hitherto inhabited by Celtic “*Boii*”, the “*Russians*”¹ southward, then N.E. and S.E. : while other tribes—*Serbs* (Sarmatians), *Croats*, *Slovenes*, *Bulgarians* (these last half-Hun)—flooded southward through Hungary to the Balkans. From the northern group grew ultimately the kingdoms of Poland, Lithuania, Bohemia ; from the southern, the states of Croatia, Carinthia, etc., on the west, to the east, Bosnia, etc., and the kingdoms of Bulgaria and Serbia—encroaching on Byzantine territory, the two last threatening in turn Byzantium itself.

Meanwhile (2) the Avars, the Turanian tribe, who, as we mentioned, with the Lombards, had crushed the Gepidae and seized Dacia in 568, now occupied the whole of

¹ The name “*Poles*” does not appear till later , the name “*Russians*” later still (see p. 68), with the conquest of the country by “*Ruric the Jute*” in 862 —On the Venedae and Sarmatians, see *sup.* p. 14.

"Hungary": severing the northern from the southern Slavs, warring with Byzantium to the east of them, and threatening the Franks to the west. Against the Avars and the Czechs, the frontier "Mark," which became Austria, was formed by the Franks; against the Wends, later, was formed the Mark of Brandenburg, the future nucleus of Prussian power.—About 800 the Avars were almost wiped out by the Franks

But the outstanding feature of the period is the spread of (3) the **Saracens**. Three great Semitic migrations had poured up from Arabia in early times, the "Accadian," circ. 2500 B.C., the "Canaanite," circ. 2000 B.C., the "Aramaic," circ. 1350 B.C.: this of the Saracens, circ. A.D. 650, about 2000 years after the last, constitutes the fourth, the greatest of them all. Two great monotheistic religions, Judaism and Christianity, had already emanated from Semitic sources: from the same fountain was now to spring a third—Mahomedanism, Moslemism, the faith of *Islam*, "Peace" or "Resignation"—a faith which taught that the tenets of its bible, the *Koran*, should be spread by the sword; that every war of the faith was a *Jihad*, or sacred war, that any Moslem who fell in such a war went straight to a Paradise furnished with beautiful *houris*, or maidens, and the best sherbet: for to the faithful all alcoholic liquor was "taboo." But most important, perhaps, of all was the doctrine that a man should acquiesce with resignation in the decrees of *Kismet*, or Fate. To the peculiar tenets of this faith is largely due the bewildering rapidity of conquest with which the Saracens, under Mahomet,¹

¹ Mahomet was born in 571 at Mecca, which has ever since been the Holy City of the Mahommedans, but in 622 he was expelled by his own tribe and fled to Medina. From this flight, the *Hegira*, of Mahomet, Mahommedans date their history, as do Christians from the birth of Christ. It was during this flight, in the solitary shelter of a cave, across

the founder of their faith, his "Caliphs" or successors, and the "Emirs" or tribal chiefs, won in 100 years an empire as wide as that of Rome itself.

In *Asia*, Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, the islands of Rhodes and Cyprus, part of Asia Minor were rapidly overrun, Damascus, Jerusalem, Aleppo fell in turn, in 669 an attack was made on Constantinople itself. In *Africa*, Alexandria was captured and Egypt won, the tide of conquest spread west to Tunis, where a new state, "Kairouan," was founded; Carthage was taken and burnt, and the last remnants of Vandal power and Byzantine suzerainty destroyed; and so, further west to Mauretania. From here the passage to *Europe* was brief in 711 the Saracen "Moors," under one Tarik, crossed to Spain, landing at "Gibraltar"—Gebel al Tarik, the hill of Tarik, defeated the Visigoths at the battle of Xeres, and mastered the peninsula, driving the Visigoths up into the hills. Subsequent attempts to carry the conquest north into Gaul were foiled at Tours, where in 732 the Saracens were severely defeated by the Franks under Charles Martel (the name "Martel," like that of the Jewish patriots, the Maccabees, means the "Hammer"), and forced back to Spain. But later, in 826, a band of Saracen corsairs from Spain or Africa seized Crete, captured Sicily, and got a footing in southern Italy—subsequently entering the Tiber with their fleets.

Meanwhile, the Saracen world had been breaking up into rival Caliphates and independent Emirates with a change of capital to mark each separate phase. Medina

the mouth of which a spider promptly wove its web, to baffle the pursuers, that Mahomet thought out his new religion.—The harem of the Mahomedan was justified by the example of the Prophet himself for whom each successive desire for a new bride was sanctioned by a special visit of the Angel Gabriel in the watches of the night.

had been the capital of Mahomet and the earlier caliphs (622-661). In 661 (1) the *Ommiads* succeeded—a dynasty founded by Muawyah, Emir of Syria—making their capital at Damascus (661-750). But in 750 Abd-er-Rahman, the Ommiad, was expelled, and, flying to Spain, founded a rival caliphate, with Cordova as capital (756-1013), including N.W. Africa. (2) Then the *Abbasides* (750-1258), tracing descent from Abbas, uncle of Mahomet, obtained the Prophet's seat, with Baghdad as capital. The most famous caliph of this line was Haroun-al-Raschid, "Haroun the Just"; hero of the *Arabian Nights*, and friend of Charlemagne. Lastly (3) the *Fatimites*¹ (909-1171), who in 661 had fled to Persia, now created a third caliphate, with Kairouan as centre, in N.W. Africa, and then, moving E., absorbed most of the Abbaside possessions in Syria and in Egypt, where Cairo, founded in 969, became their capital. Hereupon, (4) *Kairouan* became a separate Mecca of the West; and (5) the *Mekims* (Morocco) by and by became prominent under a dynasty of fanatic princes, the "Almoravides" (1060-1147)—succeeded by other fanatics, the "Almohades."

As the outcome of these various conquests the Eastern Empire had, by 800, become hopelessly curtailed on every side. On the West, the Slavs, who played to Byzantium the part which the Teutons had played to Rome, had mastered most of the Balkans; while on the East, the Greek territory in Asia had been mostly absorbed by the conquests of the Saracens.

¹ It is from the Fatimites, claiming descent from Mahomet's daughter Fatima, that the "Mahdist" troubles in Africa and the "Mohurrum" riots in India occur to-day. "Al Mahdi," "the Guide," a seer of special sanctity, had retired to a cave, the time and place of his death were never known, and the Arabs still look for the coming of this Messiah. The Mohurrum is a festival of mourning for Hosein and Hassan, killed with their father Ali, the rightful caliph, on the accession of the Ommiads.

(3) Circ. 800-1050 : Magyars, Danes, and Norse

And now, owing to this break-up of Saracen power, the curtailed Empire of the East enjoyed a temporary rest; and the Empire of the West was to suffer once more.

1. The **Magyars** Hungary had already been swept by two Turanian tribes, the Huns and Avars. Now it was to be more permanently conquered by another. In 896 the Magyars—a Tartar tribe of the Ugrian, or Ungrian branch—descending from the Urals, under one *Arpad*, rapidly overcame the country; drove the remnants of Huns, Gepidae, Slavs, Avars up into the hills; and established themselves in the fertile plains about the river Theiss. Against this new terror, the Mark of Austria was reconstructed in 966. But the Magyars were not merely a menace to the Teuton powers on the West: they proved also a bulwark to Europe against the coming Turkish peril from the East—They are the Ungrians, or “Hungarians,” of the later Dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary. (See above, p. 51, on the Huns)

2. The **Danes** had inhabited the south coast of Sweden and the adjacent isles. As the Jutes and Angles left Jutland for their new conquests in the south, the Danes spread westward to the evacuated territory—the modern Denmark; and, from here, following in the wake of the Anglo-Saxons, they too descended on the English coast in three successive centuries. The first invasion was in 787, and ended with a Danish settlement in Sheppey in 855. The second came in 871-897, and resulted in a great cession of territory, the “Danelaw,” in central England.¹

¹ Here, names ending in “by,” such as Kirby, still tell of Danish occupancy; and the “long skulls” of many of the inhabitants point to previous intermixture with the Danes. (See Ethnological Table, Appendix II) The second invasion was in the time of Alfred the Great.

The third began in 980, with the exaction of "Danegeld," an annual tax, continued 1002-1013, owing to a foolish massacre of the Danes in England by Ethelred the Unready, with the conquest of the country by *Svegen*, King of Denmark; and ended 1013-1066 with a succession of Danish, or half-Danish kings upon the English throne. At this point the Normans, cousins and allies of the Danes, intervened in Britain; and henceforth the story of the Danes is connected with their Scandinavian neighbours in Norway and Sweden, to the north.

3. The Norse. As the movements of the Anglo-Saxons had led to those of the Danes, so those of the Danes now led to those of the Norse. (1) 600-800. For two centuries the Norse "Vikings," as they were called, harried, without settlement, by sea, the coasts of Gaul, Britain, and "Russia" (2) 800-1000. Their first effective settlement was in *Russia*: where in 862, one "Ruric the Jute," invited over by one of several warring Slavic tribes, established at Novgorod a Norse dynasty, which lasted 700 years, formed the nucleus of the future Russian Empire, and incidentally supplied a title for the country itself: for it is from these "Ruotsi" or rowers—a Finnish word applied to the wild rovers of the sea—that the name of Russia is derived. Their next conquest, occurring 50 years later, was to have a wide influence on countries further south. In 911, one Rolf or Rollo, a Norse sea-king, founded on the coast of Gaul a settlement which, under the name of *Normandy*, became, with Rouen as its capital, an independent Duchy of France. Lastly, 50 years later again, *Greenland* was acquired by the Norse. (3) 1000-1200. It was from the second of these, the French Duchy of Normandy, that fresh conquests were to come: conquests more political in character, and now

connected with the "Norman" name—those of England and S Italy.

England was already closely associated with Normandy. The Danes, its last conquerors, were allies of the Normans. The deposed Saxon king, Ethelred the Unready, had married a Norman wife, and fled to Normandy for refuge; his son, Edward the Confessor, trained in Normandy, had brought many Norman barons over with him on his succession to the English throne; and it was in an England, already half-Normanised, that William the Conqueror, Duke of Normandy, cousin of the last monarch, and claimant, by kinship and promise, of his crown, landed in 1066.—The advent of the Normans in *Italy* is scarcely less momentous. In 1016 a band of Norman adventurers crossed the Alps, and in 1040 their leader, defeating the Greeks, called himself "Count" of Apulia. But the main Norman enterprise in Italy is connected with the family of Guiscard. In 1060 Robert Guiscard became "Duke of Apulia" and completed the expulsion of the Greeks from southern Italy; his brother, Roger I, similarly expelled the Saracens from Sicily, and in 1090 took the title of "Count" of the island; lastly, in 1127, Roger II, son of Roger I, acquired Naples, and united the Norman possessions in Italy and Sicily into one realm, bearing, later, the name of the "Kingdom of the Two Sicilies." The possession of the "Two Sicilies" changed hands again and again in later days: but the division of Italy into two, which the Norman conquest had created, continued right down to modern times.

The Norse conquerors of Russia, descending by river, often harried Byzantine territory; and in 1081, at the battle of Durazzo,¹ the Normans from Italy, under Robert

¹ Many of the Norse from Russia took service under the Greek Emperor as mercenaries—the famous "Varangians." At the battle of Durazzo they met in conflict with their brethren, the Norse from Italy

Guiscard, defeated the Eastern Emperor in Greece itself. But it was mainly to the Teutons in the West that Norse and Magyar were a standing menace.—The tale of Mahommedan encroachment on the Eastern Empire, after this temporary respite, may now be resumed.

C. FINAL FALL OF THE EASTERN EMPIRE TO THE TURKS: CIRC. 1050-1550 A.D.*

(4) Circ. 1050-1300: Seljuk Turks and Mongols (The Crusades, 1096-1272)

The Turks and Mongols, both Turanian by race, engrossed the conquests of the Saracens, and at the same time embraced their religion: so the Turkish aggression is in a way a continuation of the Saracen. Indeed, it is as champions of the Abbaside caliph against the Fatimite upstart that the Turks first appear; and, when both these caliphates were overthrown, the position of caliph of the whole Mahommedan world was ultimately assumed by the sultan of the Turks.

(a) The **Seljuk Turks** came from the East of the Caspian and took their name from the founder of the dynasty, one Seljuk, who, circ. 1000, revolted from his "Sultan," Mahmoud of Gazna, in Turkestan. Entering Baghdad in triumph in 1058, they quickly mastered Persia, Syria, and Asia Minor: where in 1074 they founded, with Iconium as capital, a power called, in imitation of the Roman Empire, the "Kingdom of Roum." The overthrow of the Fatimites in Egypt in 1171 fulfilled the religious mission of the Turks and at the same time placed one more province under Turkish rule, which now included practically what the Abbaside Saracens had held.

But the new Turkish Sultanate, like the old Saracen Caliphate, had already broken up. (1) The original *Kingdom of Roum* lasted in its entirety 1058-1092. (2) It then broke up into *five sultanates*, 1092-1145. And presently (3) the *Atabek* tribe under one Noureddin at Aleppo, 1145-1174, (4) the *Ayabite* tribe under the famous Saladin in Egypt, 1174-1215, (5) the *Mamelukes*, slaves of the Ayabites, 1215, had achieved in turn an empire of their own. And, almost coincident with this disintegration, the Crusades began, checking further, for the time, the growth of Turkish Empire.

(b) The Crusades (1096-1272) are intimately connected with the Empire of the Seljuk Turks (1074-1304); they cover almost the same period; and each stage in the history of that Empire is punctuated by a new Crusade. The Mahommedan Saracens, for all their fanaticism, had still allowed Christian pilgrims to visit the Holy Sepulchre: the Mahommedan Turks, with the zeal of converts to a new religion, withdrew that license. Hence the mission of the *First* Crusade (1096-1099), launched when the "kingdom of Roum" was weakening: it resulted in the establishment of the Frankish "Kingdom of Jerusalem." The *Second* (1147-1185) was due to the seizure of Edessa, part of the Frankish kingdom, by Noureddin in 1145. The *Third* (1189-1192) was owing to Saladin's recapture of Jerusalem itself in 1187.—These three form a group by themselves: they aimed directly at Palestine, and, with the exception of the Third, were wholly sent by land.

But to this passage by land—their land—the Greek Emperors had long demurred: they had even conspired with their own Moslem enemies to baffle the Crusading hosts. So the *Fourth* (1201-1204) was sent by sea. It got no further than Constantinople itself: where the

Crusaders, after a quarrel with the Greeks, stormed the Byzantine capital, and established a "Latin Empire," which lasted fifty years (1204–1261). By sea also the *Fifth* (1216–1220), *Sixth* (1249–1250), and *Seventh* (1270–1272) were sent, having now as their objective Egypt and the Mamelukes. They were all ineffective.—In 1244, between the Fifth and Sixth Crusades, Jerusalem was seized by the Chorasmians, a sect of Mahomedan fanatics, flying before the Mongols; and from that day the Holy City has never—until recent years—been in Christian hands.

(c) Meanwhile, the Mongol storm had burst on the weakening Seljuk Empire itself. In 1206, Zinghis, "Khan" or Emperor of the Tartars, began one of those sweeping Turanian raids, of which we have already seen examples in the Scythians and the Huns. By him and his four successors, India, China, Siberia were invaded; Russia was conquered, nine sacks being filled with the right ears of the slain, and a Mongol "Khanate of Kipchak" or the "Golden Horde" was established on the Volga for 360 years (1224–1584). Persia was mastered; Egypt, under its Mamelukes,¹ weathered the storm. But Syria, Armenia, Mesopotamia succumbed. And in 1258, just two hundred years after the advent of the Seljuk Turks, Baghdad, their sacred protectorate, was captured; al Mostasem, the last Saracen caliph, was put to death; and the reign of the Abbasides, sole relic of Saracen power, came definitely to an end. With it the fabric of Seljuk supremacy crumbled to the ground.'

¹ The subsequent history of the Mamelukes is noticeable. They survived not merely this, the first, Mongol invasion of 1258, but the second of 1400. They succumbed to the Ottoman Turks in 1517 and this may be considered the end of their political existence. They revived, however, about 1750, met with defeat from Napoleon at the Battle of the Pyramids in 1798; and were finally massacred by the Ottomans in 1811.

The Eastern Empire had not lost much in territory during this period. One set of aggressors, the Saracens, had been merely exchanged for another, the Seljuk Turks, and the Mongol invasion, following on their own disintegration and the check of the Crusades, had temporarily crippled these. But it had lost much in prestige, and, by its suicidal policy, had prepared the way for further trouble in future time. Instead of using the Crusades to crush the Turks—the only course by which it could have been saved—it had alienated the sympathy of Western Europe by opposing the Crusades in every way; it had been humbled by the Crusaders themselves; and its insistent enemy, the Turk, still remained, scotched but not killed, and ready to emerge once more as soon as the Mongol storm had passed.

(5) Circ. 1300-1550: the Ottoman Turks

That time was not long in coming.—It is interesting to notice the difference between Aryan and Oriental conquest. The Teuton conquerers had usually begun in tribes, had ended in one united whole: this had been so in France, Spain, Britain. With Semite and Turanian, the opposite had been the case: sweeping conquest, one huge empire, prompt disintegration into parts—invariably formed their history. It had been so with Saracen Caliphate, with Turkish Sultanate: and now the tale of Mongol Khanate was to be the same. Within a few years of the victories of Zinghis Khan and his successors, the Mongol Empire they had created crumbled away. Indeed, the continuity of Turkish, of Mahommedan conquest had hardly been interrupted. Turks had been employed in the Mongol armies, the Mongols had, in the course of

their conquests, themselves become Mahommedan, and, when the Mongol tide receded, it was from the original centre of Turkish power, the "Kingdom of Roum," that Turkish aggression was to lift up its head once more.

(a) 1304—1360: *the Ottomans in Asia* — In 1304, *Othman* or *Osman* (1299—1326), Emir of Iconium or Roum, declared himself independent of his master, the Seljuk Sultan; and the separate history of the Ottomans, or Osmanlis, named after him, began. Attack on the Eastern Empire, so long delayed, now recommenced. *Brusa*, near the sea of Marmora, was captured in 1326, and became the capital of the new empire in Asia Minor: which, by the end of Othman's reign, was almost wholly in Turkish hands. It was left for his son *Orchan* (1326—1402) to take the further step.

(b) 1360—1402: *the Ottomans in Europe*.—The Turks were now looking straight on Europe; and it could only be a matter of time when they set foot on the European shore. The position of the Persians and Greece was once more reproduced. As, one thousand years before, dissensions at Rome had afforded the Huns an entrance into the Western Empire, so now dissensions at Constantinople offered the Turks, kinsmen of the Huns, an access to the Empire of the East; and by 1360, the last year of Orchan's reign, Ottoman power was well established in Thrace. *Amurath I.* (1360—1389), his successor, continued the conquest, capturing *Adrianople*, which now became the European capital of the Turks, and defeating a combined army of Serbians, Hungarians, and others at a sanguinary battle at *Kossovo*¹

¹ The battle is further famous for the first appearance of the "Janissaries"—*Yenghi Cheri* or New Troops—a body of men formed by Orchan in 1328, and from that time onward recruited yearly by a thousand Christian children, taken from their parents and trained to military life.—The battle still marks a black-letter day in the calendar of Serbian history.

in Serbia, 1389. He was murdered after the battle by a Serbian captive, and, in revenge, the Turks blinded thousands of Serbian prisoners, and so sent them home. *Bajazet* (1389-1403), the next ruler, first "sultan" of the Ottomans—his three predecessors had been content to retain the title of Emir—overran what remained to the Greeks in Thrace, Macedonia, and Thessaly; had subjected the Hungarians to another severe defeat; and was preparing to attack Constantinople itself,—when once more Turkish conquest received a check.

(c) 1402-1420: *Second Mongol Interlude*.—About 1390 *Timour Lenk* (Timour the Lame) or Tamerlane, a descendant of Zinghis, a man more terrible than Zinghis, began a second sweeping Mongol raid. Russia, Persia, Turkestan, India were overrun once more. Then, hearing of the success of the Ottomans, he turned back westward to teach subjection to the Turks. Arrived in Syria, he laid Damascus in ashes. On the ruins of Baghdad he erected a pyramid of 90,000 heads. And pressing on into Asia Minor, he defeated and captured the Turkish Sultan at the battle of *Angora* in 1402. The tribute which Bajazet was just exacting from the Greek emperor, was now diverted into the coffers of Timour; Bajazet himself, shut in an iron cage, was carried about by the captor in his suite. The conquest of Constantinople was delayed by this defeat for fifty years.¹

(d) 1420-1453: *the Fall of Constantinople*.—Three years after Angora, Timour died; within twenty years of his death this Mongol empire also, like that of Zinghis, had melted away, and the Turks had once more resumed the

¹ Transient as they were in the main, the Mongol conquests effected certain results. The first, that of Zinghis (circa 1250), had planted a Mongol Khanate in Russia. The second, this of Timour, circa 1400, left a Mongol dynasty in Persia. A third, launched by Baber, a descendant of Timour, founded presently, in 1526, the great Mogul Empire in India, confining the Hindoos to the centre, west, and south.

offensive. The end came with the accession of *Mahomet II.* (1451-1481). In April 1453, the siege of Constantinople began. The strength and position of the city, the use of "Greek fire" (burning naphtha), and the accession of supplies by sea, enabled the besieged to hold out for a month. Then one morning the Greeks woke in amazement to find a fleet of Turkish vessels in their great harbour, the Golden Horn: Mahomet had transported them here on wheels during the night from the Sea of Marmora across six miles of intervening land. The grand assault began. A breach was effected in the walls: the church of St. Sophia, with other buildings, was wrapt in flames; and the assailants poured in on every side.—On 29th May 1453, Constantinople fell; Constantine Palaeologus, last of the Greek emperors, perished in the assault, and the Eastern Empire was at an end.

(e) 1453-1550: *subsequent Conquests of the Turks.*—The fate of the Balkan Peninsula was now sealed, and by the end of Mahomet's reign, Greece, Albania, the Crimea were all in Turkish hands. *Selmu I.* (1512-1520) mastered S-W. Asia and N.-E. Africa, crushing the Mamelukes in 1517. But it was under *Solyman II. the Magnificent* (1520-1566) that the Ottoman Empire, or "Porte"—as it came to be called, from *porta*, the Palace "door"—reached its height. Rhodes was captured; Algeria and N.-W. Africa were subdued; most of all, Hungary, which, under the Magyar patriot, John Hunyadi (1446-1453), had offered obstinate resistance, and came now to form the main barrier to Turkish aggression, was hopelessly defeated at the bloody battle of *Mohacs* in 1526, and half of the country became a Turkish province.¹ Not merely had the

¹ Under *Selmu II.*, 1566-1574, Cyprus and many of the Ionian islands were secured. But by this time the decline of the Turkish Empire had begun, the western kingdoms were uniting a little against

Eastern Empire fallen, but the Christian powers of Western Europe—just now in the internal throes of the Reformation struggle—were threatened with the terror of a Mahomedan menace, advancing on them from the East

THE TEUTON DREAM OF THE REVIVAL OF THE EMPIRE OF THE WEST

But it is with Rome, and with the West, that the "Roman Empire" is essentially connected; and, while the Eastern Empire was gradually shrinking before the encroachments of Slav and Saracen and Turk, in the West, under the auspices of its German conquerors, a new Roman Empire had been rising, Phoenix-like, from the ashes of the old; and from this, another; and from this, eventually, was to emerge a third. or rather a series of mock Roman Empires, each less Roman and less imperial than the one before. For though the German "Kaiser" derived his name from the Roman "Caesar," the "Holy Roman Empire," as it was called in its new German form, bore, even in its first presentment, little resemblance to its great original.

Germany, Austria, France, Spain, and even, in a religious sense, Italy itself—all the German kingdoms indeed (except England) which rose out of the ruins of the Roman Empire—have attempted in turn to realise the dream of its

the common foe; and the *Peace of Carlowitz*, 1699—following on a defeat of the Turks by the Hungarians and Austrians combined—marked the limits of Turkish aggression westward. Presently the existing empire itself began to be curtailed. In 1804 began the movement of Slavs, Greeks, and other Christians, in 1849 came a second movement; in 1875 a third. And by this time first Russia, then Austria—rather than Turkey—were beginning to be the powers in Eastern Europe to be feared.

revival Each attempt has ended in nothing but disturbing menace to Europe generally, and disaster to the country by whom the attempt was made. While England, the one exception—separated by her narrow strip of water from such chimerical ambitions—has early materialised into a kingdom, and, amid the unrest of Europe, has even been building up a different empire overseas. other nations, those of the Continent, lured on by the dream of reviving in Europe the world-empire of ancient Rome, have not merely failed in their imperial attempts, but have been rendered late in realising their own internal unity; Germany herself, the latest of them all. But still the attempts have continued to be made.

It is the object of the following brief sketch to show how the whole of European history has been affected by this fatal dream—how the tradition of the Roman Empire has hung like a nightmare over Europe, even to the present day

THE TRADITION OF THE ROMAN
EMPIRE

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER IV

1. 800-1254: FIRST TEUTON ATTEMPT—"HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE" (PAPAL PERIOD)

(1) "*The Holy Roman Empire*"

Holy Roman Empire ceases in its first form after 1254, its second phase under Hapsburg Austria; the third, new empire of the Hohenzollerns of Prussia.

(2) 476-800: *Its first formation under Charlemagne the Frank*

- (a) Barbarian conquerors acknowledge Eastern Emperor.
- (b) Pope as successor to Emperor on religious side
- (c) Fear of Lombards and quarrel with Greek Emperor cause Pope to unite with Barbarians. Frankish Empire of Charlemagne (Germany, France, and Italy), and separation of West from East, 800.

(3) 800-962: *Its re-formation under Otto the Saxon.*

- (a) Carolingian Kingdom of East Franks 843. Chaos after death of Charlemagne; separation of West and East Franks at Treaties of Verdun, 843, and Mersen, 870.
- (b) Elective monarchy of German Princes, 911. Henry I; Otto the Great, the Saxon (East Franks); Kingdom of Germany.
- (c) Union of German Monarchy and Roman Papacy: 962 Otto crowned Emperor by Pope, 962. (Empire, Germany, and Italy.)

(4) 962-1056: *Supremacy of the Emperors to death of Henry III.*

Evil of Empire to Italy, Germany, the world

Anomalies in (1) conception of Empire, (2) relation of Pope and Emperor, (3) individuality of each.—A German Empire, not embracing Christendom; Pope and Emperor never equal; each several capacities.

(5) 1056-1254: *Triumph of Papacy.*

- (a) Nomination and Investiture (the Franconian Emperors) Quarrels between Pope and Emperor on (1) nomination, (2) investiture, (3) Papal States
- (b) The Hohenstaufens and the Papal States. Success of Pope in war of Gwelfs (papal) and Ghibelines (imperial) Peace of Constance (1183) marks triumph of Papacy and freedom of Republics.
- (c) The power of the Popes. Power of Pope in Europe: excommunication, interdiction, the Crusades, the monasteries—The great Popes.

The Pope now a temporal prince; Italy practically separate from Germany.—Virtual end of Holy Roman Empire.

CHAPTER IV

1. 800-1254. FIRST TEUTON ATTEMPT—"HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE" (PAPAL PERIOD)

(1) THE "HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE."

"The king is dead : long live the king !" The Roman Empire of the Caesars had been overthrown by Teuton hordes ; all that remained of Caesar's imperial power survived in the person of a Roman Pope ; and now, on the ruins of the old Empire a new Empire was to be built, formed by the strange conjunction of these two, Roman Pope and Teuton conqueror : an empire known in history as the "Holy Roman Empire"¹ In theory, the new Empire was one Empire and lasted a thousand years, from 800 to 1806. In reality, it began later and ended earlier, and was not one Empire but two, a second succeeding, after an interval, to the first ; while from the second, when the original "Holy Roman Empire" had died, was to emerge, after another interval, with equal claims to the same name, a third.

(1) *First Teuton Attempt*, 800 (or 962) to 1254.—The "Holy Roman Empire" is generally reckoned as beginning with

¹ The Empire was at first known simply as the "Roman Empire" the word "Holy" was first added by the Emperor Frederick I, Barbarossa, 1152-1190—just when the severance of Pope and Emperor was becoming emphasised.

the coronation of the Frankish **Charlemagne** by the Pope in 800: an Empire covering, in idea, the Christian world; in fact, including Germany, France, and northern half of Italy, with Spain from the Ebro to the Pyrenees. But after his death his Empire was divided, in 843, into three parts, East, West, and Middle; and it is rather with its re-establishment in 962 by the Saxon **Otto**, King of the Eastern part, a Teuton Empire with the same universal pretensions, but embracing now only Germany and Italy—France, the western division, had meanwhile become a separate kingdom—that the “Holy Roman Empire” really begins. Even so, it lasted, in anything like its original conception, only three centuries: centuries of continual struggle between Pope and Emperor, during the first of which, 962-1056, the Emperor prevailed; during the two last, 1056-1254—the period of the Crusades—the Pope. After 1254, though the title of Emperor was still retained by Teuton monarchs, the Empire, in its first form, was practically at an end. †

(2) *Emergence of France*: 1254-1437.—Then followed two centuries, beginning with an interregnum in Germany and continuing with a succession of various dynasties—one of the most troubled periods of the Middle Ages—during which the breach widened between Pope and Emperor; from 1254 onwards few Emperors were crowned by the Pope at all. Meanwhile, the triumphant Papacy itself soon became corrupted with its own success, declined in character internally, and lost influence with the outer world; the Empire, already weakened, became weaker still; and the German States made themselves virtually independent of Pope and Emperor alike. It was in this period of general weakness that **France**, which had once formed the western part of Charlemagne’s domain but had

since been left behind in the imperial race, began to find herself, to interfere in the affairs of Papal Italy, and, presently, emerging from the long struggle with Anglo-Saxon Britain, which meanwhile had hampered her, to put in a claim for Empire on her own behalf.

(3) *Second Teuton Attempt*: 1437-1648.—From this time, 1437, to the end of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806, the emperors were, with one exception, drawn from the **Austrian House of Hapsburg**. It was to an Empire very different from the first that they succeeded—an Empire consisting of little more than Germany, and this a mere bundle of half-independent states. But they managed to amass a power, which for two centuries, 1437-1648, was a threat to Europe. Alliance by marriage with Spain—soon to become, with the Netherlands and her new American colonies, the strongest European State—increased considerably their temporal power; the Reformation movement, which menaced the authority of Pope and Emperor alike, caused some *rapprochement* between Germany and Italy; and it looked for a moment as if a second Teuton Empire was to materialise—an Empire now also allied to Spain. But, with the decline of Spain, Austria declined; the Reformation struggle proved too much for both Pope and Emperor; and the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648, which concluded it, —a political and religious war in one—marked at once the emancipation of the Protestants from Papal control, the freedom of the German princes from their Emperor, and the break up of the Austro-Spanish power. By 1648 the Empire had almost ceased to exist, even in its second and more purely German form.

(4) *French bid for Empire*: 1648-1806 —During the final period of the Holy Roman Empire, what remained of imperial power was crippled further by two breaks in the

Hapsburg line. In 1700 the Spanish Hapsburgs became extinct, and the **French House of Bourbon** obtained, after a struggle, the Spanish throne. In 1740 the Austrian Hapsburgs were left without male issue: another struggle followed, once more Austria suffered—this time at the hands of the Hohenzollerns of Prussia—a territorial loss. But the whole epoch, from the imperial point of view, is dominated by the disturbing ambitions of France: who first, under the Bourbon King, **Louis XIV.**, aimed at Empire in Europe; then, when this failed, sought, under **Louis XV.**, a colonial Empire abroad; and lastly—after the earthquake of the great Revolution of 1789—succeeded, under **Napoleon**, in establishing a European Empire which, for a few years, was bigger and more menacing than any Teuton Empire of the past. In 1804 the Hapsburg Emperor, beaten to his knees by a series of crushing blows, and anticipating the evil day, assumed the sub-title of “Emperor of Austria”; in 1806 he resigned the higher title, and became in name also, what he had long been in fact, Emperor of Austria alone.—The “Holy Roman Empire” was definitely at an end.

(5) *Third Teuton Attempt: 1806-1914.*—The Holy Roman Empire was at an end: but already a new Teuton Empire was in the making, no less, in its inner origin, derived from Rome. France had only been clearing the way for the emergence of a power other than her own: she continued unconsciously to do the same. The final overthrow in 1815 of the Napoleonic menace left two main rivals—Hapsburg Austria, with all her past behind her, and Hohenzollern Prussia, with all her future before her—face to face. A series of European revolutions—reflections of the great French Revolution and, like it, all emanating from France—succeeded: during which Prussia steadily

gained, and Austria, as steadily, lost in power. In 1849, after the last of them, the imperial crown was actually offered to Prussia by the German states, but was at the time declined. Then, after a pause, Prussia suddenly and definitely, on her own initiative, emerged, and in three wars, within a brief period of ten years, attained the primal place. A war with Denmark in 1864 extended her territory to the Western seas; a war with Austria in 1866 left her mistress of all northern Germany; a war in 1870 with France—the latter playing her unwilling part of procuress to the last—made her, in 1871, head of a new German Empire: an Empire which, as soon as it had time to consolidate itself, was to convulse the peace of Europe more cruelly than any Empire that had gone before.

Voltaire has said of the Holy Roman Empire, in the days of its decline, that "it was neither Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire." The saying was true, in reality, of "Roman" from the very first, it became true of "Holy" before long; it proved true of "Empire" in the latter end. But none the less the "Holy Roman Empire"—and its successor, the new German Empire—have owed, in theory, their origin to Rome. Ancient history had turned on the old Roman Empire—its creation, its tenour, its overthrow by Teuton conquerors; Mediaeval and Modern history has turned on its semi-revival, in Teuton form, under the Frankish Charlemagne—the division of the Carolingian Empire into East, West, and Middle; the struggle of the Eastern kingdom, or Germany, with the Western kingdom, France, to absorb into themselves the Middle kingdom, the ambition of both to reunite all three, at one time with Spain, under their own auspices—to extend the whole to the dimensions of imperial Rome.*

That reunion, even in its full Carolingian form, has never been realised: Germany and France have always remained separate since 843, the Middle kingdom has had a varying fate; outlying regions of the old Roman Empire have lasted almost unabsorbed. And with each attempt to realise the great original, Europe has been disturbed from end to end. But while France, in spite of many efforts, has practically failed, Germany has three times partially achieved success. The first revival, under Otto, was German in character—unchallenged by France; the second, under Austria—challenged more and more vigorously by France, and finally overthrown by her—was also German; the third, and most real of all, under Prussia, was German too.

The Kaisers of all three traced their political descent—as they also took their title—from the Caesars of the West; by Teutons the Roman Empire had been overthrown; the tradition of its revival under Teuton auspices has never died.

(2) 476—800: ITS FIRST FORMATION UNDER CHARLEMAGNE THE FRANK

(a) *The Teuton Conquerors*

This continuance of the great Empire which Rome had built, from Roman into Teuton times, is due largely to one fact: Rome fell in 476, but in a sense she never fell at all. Her fall had begun indeed as early as 300, it continued as late as 558; but, just as Greece had mastered her Roman conqueror, so Rome had already dominated her Teuton invaders even before they conquered her, and their conquest marked only another, if an altered, phase of Roman life.—

It is with the last wave of Teuton inroads, the **Lombard invasion** of 568, that this new phase begins

The foreign conquerors—Goths, Franks, Vandals—had themselves formed part of the Roman armies, and half learned the civilisation of Rome before they entered Roman territory. The very inroads of Huns, Franks, Goths, Vandals, Lombards had often been prompted by the invitation of a Roman Caesar, when the earlier invasions had swept back, the motley relics of Attila's army had formed, many of them, a confederate army along the north, to protect the failing Empire from fresh assault, after the invaders finally entered the outlying districts of the Empire, both the Visigoths and the Franks, as now forming part of that Empire, had assisted the Romans at Chalons against the Huns—The Teutons were half Romanised before they came; they came often at the desire of Rome; as soon as they came they identified themselves with Roman interests.

Not merely had Teuton invaders been absorbing Roman culture in the provinces of Rome, but individual Teutons had wormed their way into the heart of Italy itself. Long before Rome fell, the Vandal Stilicho, the Suevian Ricimer, the Herulian Odoacer had in turn under the feeble emperors guided the Roman affairs of state, commanded the Roman armies, defended Roman territory against other Teuton invaders. When the last of these, **Odoacer**, by force of circumstances, assumed the real control, and became in 476 the first barbarian ruler of Rome, he did not even take the name of "King." When Theodoric, the Ostrogoth, in 493, overthrew Odoacer he was proclaimed, indeed, "King of the Goths and Romans" in Italy, but even this only with the consent of the Emperor of the East. to the title of "Caesar" not even he presumed. And when in 553 the Ostrogoth kingdom was in its turn overthrown by Justinian,

the Eastern Emperor, Italy became, by the establishment of the Greek "Exarchate of Ravenna," still further attached to the Empire of the East. It remained so in name even after the advent of the Lombards in 568.

The fact was that the Roman Empire had been co-extensive with civilisation; its destruction was unthinkable, and its Teuton conquerors entered it with no conception of a great thing overthrown. The personal Emperor of the West had fallen; but the Western Empire itself still remained. The Franks in Gaul, the Visigoths in Spain, even—as yet—the Lombards in Italy were inheritors of a past which they themselves had partly shared; their rulers were pupils no less than conquerors—stewards of a great trust; and in the temporary absence of a separate Emperor of the West, one and all acknowledged the Emperor of the East as universal Roman Emperor of whose Empire Italy in particular, through the Exarchate of Ravenna, was now an appanage.

Italy, even under the Lombards, still practically owned the authority of the Eastern Emperor.

(b) *The Italian Papacy*

But the Roman Empire had not merely been co-extensive with civilisation: it had been for the last 150 years co-extensive also with Christendom; and here another element came in. The Roman Emperor had not merely been the civil head of the Empire: he had also been Pontifex Maximus, chief priest—its religious head. He had even, under the old regime, been deified, under the new, the Christian, he had still remained the apex of religion. Rome, as the head of civil government, had fallen; she still lived as head of religion in the West, and as the Empire had decayed the Church had become proportionately stronger. The Roman

Emperor, as civil governor, had fallen, and different Teuton conquerors might take over the reins of civil government, but even under Teuton conquest there was still a Roman successor to the Emperor as religious Pontiff—a successor becoming similarly stronger year by year—the Pope.¹

From the earliest times of the Church the Pope claimed to hold from St Peter “the Keys of Heaven and Earth.” A train of events came gradually to give new meaning to this idea. The deed of gift by which Pope Sylvester was said in 314—the year after the famous “Edict of Milan”—to have received from Constantine control of the Church and Province of Italy, has long been proved to be, what it is now called, a “**Forged Donation.**” But the deed was accepted as genuine for several centuries; and anyhow it represents fairly the idea of the times—the actual access which came to Papal power in Rome with the first conversion of an Emperor to Christianity, with the removal of the imperial court from Italy to Constantinople in 330, with the severance in 364 of the Eastern Empire from the West.

During the century which followed, the writings of the Latin “Fathers”—Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine of Hippo; the conversion of barbarians—Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and others; even—in the case of Ambrose—the reproval of an Emperor, brought additional power to the Church at large; while successful controversy with the Patriarch of Constantinople, definite recognition of the Roman Pontiff by

¹ The word “*Pope*” is simply the Greek “Pappas,” “Papa,” “Father”: a term applicable to all Bishops. It was first adopted by Hyginus in 139; and was confined to the Bishop of Rome in 606 by Phocas, Emperor of the East, on the request of Boniface III, who was thus the first “Pope.” The term *Pontiff* is derived from the old Roman “Pontifex Maximus,” head of religious matters: one of the many offices assumed by Augustus at the beginning of the Roman Empire, and adopted by other Emperors after him till the time of Gratian (375–383), Western Emperor, just after the division of the Empire into East and West.

the Council of Sardica in 378, and the courageous attitude of the Popes **Innocent I.** (402-417) and **Leo I.** (440-461), as contrasted with the craven attitude of the last Caesars, in the face of the invading Visigoths, Huns, and Vandals, increased the importance of the Papacy itself. Finally, when the fall of Rome in 476 left the Western Empire bereft of its old union of temporal authority, the only union remaining in the West was the union of religion, viz the Papal power.—The Pope of Rome had become, in the chaos of the Teuton invasions, the successor of the Roman Caesar of the West.

The power so gained was further extended during the next two hundred years by fresh controversial victories over the Greek Patriarch; by the continued writings of the "Fathers" of the Latin Church; and by the conversion of more barbarians—Franks, Anglo-Saxons, and even Lombards—to Christianity. The chief agent in all three was the third of the great Popes and fourth of the Latin Fathers, **Gregory I** (590-604). By 650 nearly all the barbarians had been converted—many of them indeed only to Arianism, but some of them, especially the Franks, to the full Roman Catholic faith—mainly through Papal influence; and the power of the Pope was predominant over the whole of the old Western Empire.

But even so the Roman Pope, like the Teuton conqueror, still recognised the authority, if not of the Greek Patriarch, at any rate of the Greek Emperor; and Italy, in religion as in politics, was still attached to the Empire of the East.

(c) *Union of Teuton Conqueror and Roman Pope*

The Lombard invasion of Italy in 568 proved ultimately, however, to have marked a turning-point in the history of

the West ; and two events, now occurring at the same time—a revival of the Lombard peril, following on a quarrel with the Eastern court—produced suddenly an unexpected position of affairs, from which a new era may be said to date.

The Lombards had been successfully converted to Christianity within a century of their entrance into Roman territory—by about 650 ; but with the Lombards—the most uncivilised of the barbarian conquerors—conversion was not enough, and in this last Teuton invader of Italy the Popes found an enemy, against whose further aggression neither Gregory nor his successors were able, without temporal assistance, to hold their own. And presently controversy with the Greek Church assumed the more serious form of controversy with the Greek Emperor himself. The climax of both difficulties—the Lombard and the Greek—came in what is known as the “Iconoclast,” or “Image-breaking” movement. In 726 the Greek Emperor *Leo III*, stung by a Saracen taunt of idolatry, decided to abolish the worship of the crucifix and the images of saints. The Pope resented the decision as heresy ; the Italian people rose in defence of the cherished symbols of their religion ; and *Lieudprand*, the Lombard king, whose designs were to form a Lombard kingdom over the whole of Italy, seized the opportunity by falling on the Greek Exarchate as being the defiler of the sacred emblems, on Papal Rome as being a part of the Greek Empire.—The Pope found himself between the devil and the deep sea : he was powerless, with the Papal forces, against the Lombards, and, owing to the image-difference, he could not now look to his natural protector and superior, the Eastern Emperor.

In this dilemma his eyes turned naturally northwards for help to the Franks, just then the most powerful of the

Teuton conquerors and one of the few who had adopted the full Roman faith. After the death, in 511, of Clovis, founder, as we have mentioned, of the Frankish Kingdom in France, there had been some extension of Frankish territory, and members of his line, the Merovingian, still held the Frankish throne. But most of his successors had been feeble rulers, the later kings so much so that they are known in history as “Les Rois fainéants,” the Sluggard Kings; and the control of affairs had fallen entirely into the hands of their chief ministers—“Mayors of the Palace,”¹ as they were called.

It was to one of these that, in 732, the Pope appealed for help against his Lombard enemies: *Charles Martel*, virtual ruler of the Frankish realm, and just victor in the same year over the infidel Saracens at Tours. Charles died before he could obey this second religious call, but the appeal is important, as marking a fresh connection of imperial Rome with the new Teuton powers. It was signalised by the bestowal of the Roman title of “Patricius” upon his house for ever. In 754, *Pepin le Bref*, son of Charles Martel, descended, in response to a similar appeal, on Italy; defeated the Lombards, and bestowed the Greek Exarchate on the Pope himself—a gift destined to have incalculable bearing on future times. As a reward, Pepin was anointed “King of the Franks” by the Pope’s delegate: inaugurating thereby a new Frankish dynasty, called, after his yet greater son, the “Carlovingian.” Lastly, in 774, *Charlemagne*, son of Pepin, on the recurrence of the old Lombard trouble, finally mastered Lombardy and made it part of the Frankish kingdom: at the same time confirming his father’s gift of the Exarchate to the Papal See.

¹ The term is variously interpreted as “Major Domus,” Chamberlain of the House, and “Mord-dômes,” Judges of Murder.

So far, in spite of the seizure of the Exarchate in northern Italy, there had been no definite breach with the Eastern Empire. All three Frankish rulers had received from the Pope only the title of "Patricius" of Rome; Roman Pope and Frankish monarch had not ceased to acknowledge the nominal authority of Constantinople; and southern Italy still literally belonged to Greece. But meanwhile Charlemagne was growing in power and importance. He had begun as King of the *Franks* in Gaul. He had just placed on his head the iron crown of the *Lombards* at Milan in Italy. He now extended his possessions eastward into Germany, as far as the Elbe, by the conquest of the wild *Saxon* tribes. He carried the war with the *Saracens*¹ southward into Spain itself: forming against them a Spanish Mark (Navarre). He almost destroyed the *Avars* of Hungary: here he strengthened his position by establishing an Eastern Mark (Austria). He warded off the growing menace of the *Norse*.

The power of the Franks was now at its height, and the power of the Eastern Empire had just been temporarily weakened by the accession of a woman—the Empress *Irene*—to the Eastern throne when once more an injury to the Pope—this time a personal injury—recalled the Frankish protector into Italy, and caused the last inevitable step. In 800, Charlemagne, now Lord of France, Germany, and northern Italy—the southern half still adhered to the Greek Empire—was solemnly crowned **Emperor** by the Pope at Rome. Even now he attempted to avoid ultimate disjunction from the East, by proposing marriage with the Empress Irene and so uniting East and West again under one rule.

¹ The wars of Charlemagne, particularly those with the Saracens, long formed the theme of French romantic poetry—the hero, Roland, Duke of Brittany, and the battle of Roncevalles in Spain find there a special place.

But the attempt failed. The Western was finally separated from the Eastern dominion; and the old Roman Empire of the West was restored, under Teuton auspices, as the “Holy Roman Empire,”—a rival to the Greek Empire of the East.

The remainder of his reign (800–814) he spent at Aachen (Aix la Chapelle), his capital: organising into districts the great Empire he had built; formulating laws under heads—“capitularies”; generally spreading civilisation, religion, education over his enormous realm. In the last matter he was assisted by an Englishman, *Alcuin* of York, who founded schools of learning, simplified Greek and Latin manuscripts, and lighted a lamp of learning in the darkness of the Middle Age. He befriended Egbert of Wessex; he was respected by the Byzantine court; he won the admiration of Haroun-al-Raschid, caliph of the Saracens. It looked, for a moment, as if the old Empire of the Romans, in culture as well as power, had been really reawakened to life by the Teuton conqueror.

(3) 800–962: RECONSTRUCTION OF HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE BY OTTO THE SAXON

But the Roman Empire, as revived in its Frankish form by Charlemagne, practically ended with its founder's death; and for the next 150 years chaos reigned: during which a new kingdom, Germany, gradually emerged, and, with it, the Empire ultimately rematerialised in another—a purely German—form. The whole process falls into three rough stages.

(a) *Carlovingian Monarchy of the East Franks, 843*

The Carlovingians retained the fatal custom—not uncommon among Teuton tribes—of divided inheritance,

and quarrels among the three grandsons of Charlemagne resulted in a partition of the Empire between them by the **Treaty of Verdun**, in 843, into three parts: the Western, Eastern, and Middle Kingdoms of the Franks. The *Western* or French portion, with Paris as its chief city, went to Charles the Bald; the *Eastern*, with Frankfurt as capital, to Ludwig the German; while the *Middle* portion—an irregular strip, running down the Rhine and Rhone, and including Northern Italy—fell to Lothar I., who, as the eldest, received also the title of Emperor.

From this break-up of Charlemagne's Empire many modern states were to come into being. The Western Kingdom gradually lost the Teuton character, became merged in its Celto-Latin elements, and developed into modern *France*. The Eastern Kingdom—original home of the Teutons—resumed more and more a purely Teutonic cast, and formed a nucleus of modern *Germany*. As to the Middle Kingdom, it was destined, after a long struggle between France and Germany, either to be absorbed into France (Provence and Burgundy), or to become attached to Germany (as, for a time, Alsace and Lorraine), or to break off in separate states (*Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy* itself)

The first phase of the struggle presently appeared. On the death of Lothar, the Emperor, and his two sons, the Middle Kingdom was, by the **Treaty of Mersen**, 870, partially redivided between the two surviving brothers—the Romance portion (Burgundy and Provence) going to Charles the Bald, King of the West Franks; the German portion (Lotharingia, or Lorraine, so-called from Lothar II., son of Lothar I) to Ludwig, King of the East Franks, while Italy became a separate kingdom. As to the title of Emperor, it was taken by Charles, the elder, passing to

Ludwig on his death After that, it was held sometimes by Kings of the West Franks, sometimes by Kings of the East, sometimes by the Kings of Italy; and from time to time was in abeyance altogether.

It is by the Treaty of Mersen, even more than by that of Verdun, that Germany comes into being, as a separate state from France; and though still, like France, under a Carlovingian dynasty, and sharing with France the imperial title, took the first step to Empire.

The next step was to make the separation even more complete, and carry her still further to the imperial goal.

(b) *Elective Monarchy of German Princes, 911*

The successors of Charlemagne, both in the East and in the West, were almost as weak as those of Clovis; but while the Western Kingdom, France, was now fairly united under one head, the Eastern Kingdom, Germany, was divided against itself within, and harassed by invasions from without. The five great Dukes of *Franconia, Saxony, Bavaria, Swabia, and Lotharingia* made constant wars on one another. There was still perpetual friction with the rival Franks on the west; Danes and Norse were threatening from the north; Slavic tribes, the Wends and Czechs, were pressing in on the new kingdom from the east; the Magyars, a fresh enemy, had taken the place of the Avars on the south.—In 911, on the death of a boy King, “Ludwig the Child,” the five Dukes agreed to set aside the Carlovingian succession and elect one of their own number in his place.

Conrad of Franconia (911-918) was, in deference to Frankish tradition, first chosen King. But the choice was disputed throughout; troubles with Danes, Slavs, Magyars

continued; and the West Franks succeeded in seizing on Lorraine. At his death, and by his advice, his great rival, the Duke of Saxony, acquired the throne. From the wild Saxons, subdued only a century before by Charlemagne, a German kingdom—then a German Empire, was to spring.

Henry I., "the Fowler," Duke of Saxony (918–936), was the real founder of the German monarchy. He forced the Dukes of Swabia and Bavaria to acknowledge his supremacy. From the West Franks Lorraine was now recovered. He waged successful wars against the Danes, the Wends, the Magyars: forming *Marks* to hold the first two in check; while against the last, who gave most trouble, he planted a line of forts and organised a force of efficient cavalry. The Marks served as useful *points d'appui* for later extension of territory; the forts formed the nucleus of prosperous cities in after years; to the institution of the cavalry the Order of *Knighthood* has been assigned. City-life became a more settled custom in Henry's reign; the German-speaking tribes were drawn together into closer union under one royal sway; and, when he died in 936, he left behind him a real kingdom on which a future Empire could be based.

Otto the Great (936–973) was to Henry the Fowler what Charlemagne had been to Pepin—a son greater than his great sire. The rival Dukes, who all rose in turn once more, he once more subdued—attaching them further to himself by the assignment of duties about the throne: it is in his reign that the *four Court Offices* of Chamberlain, Steward, Seneschal, Marshal first appear. He extended his kingdom northward, by wresting Holstein and Schleswig from the Danes; eastward, from the Elbe to the Oder, by conquering the Cæchs of Bohemia and

the Wends of Poland, southward, by a descent into Italy and the reconquest of Lombardy in 951. Against the Magyars, whose inroads into Italy were still incessant, he recreated Charlemagne's Bavarian East Mark, which in the general chaos had fallen into disuse: it was to develop later into the Duchy of Austria (*Oesterreich*).

Then, in 961, he descended on Italy once more.

(c) *Union of German Monarchy with Roman Papacy, 962*

Amid the general chaos which had followed the death of Charlemagne, the condition of Italy had been most piteous of all. The Treaty of Verdun in 843 had made her part of the Middle Kingdom; the Treaty of Mersen in 870, while dividing the northern part of this between the Western and the Eastern Franks, had left Italy a separate kingdom in the south, and several of her Kings had borne the imperial title. But they had all been feeble monarchs; the condition of Italy had gone from bad to worse; and for the last generation there had been no Emperor at all.

It was in this disturbed country, and at this time of lapse in the imperial title, that Otto, third monarch of the new Eastern Kingdom, Germany, now intervened. He had already in 951 married the widow of a late Italian King; he and his father, between them, had already absorbed some of the Middle Kingdom which belonged to the Western Franks. this reconquest of Lombardy in 961 made him (with the exception of part of Burgundy, which was annexed in a later reign), master of practically the whole. In 962, Otto extracted from the Pope by force what had been granted to Charlemagne by grace, his coronation as **Emperof of the West**: an Empire covering

roughly the Eastern and Middle Kingdom of the Carolingian domain —Already, on his accession to the German throne in 836, though Frankfurt, the chief seat of the Eastern Kingdom, still remained his capital, he held a great coronation feast at Aachen, the old Frankish capital of Charlemagne, when he was waited on by the attendant Dukes.

The name "Holy Roman Empire" has sometimes been given to the Empire founded by Charlemagne, in its Frankish form, in 800; and Otto's German Empire, founded in 962, has been considered a mere continuation of it. In this sense, the "Holy Roman Empire" lasted, at any rate in name, for more than a thousand years—800 to 1806. But there was a distinct gap of anarchy between the two Empires; and they differed in many ways. Otto's, in spite of some expansion to the east, was less "imperial" in extent than Charlemagne's, by the loss of the Western Kingdom, France; it was less "Holy" and less "Roman," as being forced upon the Pope of Rome. It was, indeed, simply the existing, newly-created German monarchy, hallowed by the unwilling benediction of the Pope. On the other hand, it was more permanent in character. Just as the frontier state of Austria, founded first by Charlemagne, owes its real origin to re-formation by Otto: so the Empire of Otto, though, in a way, a successor to that of Charlemagne, was, in still more ways, a new creation. And it is to this new creation—entirely German—lasting from 962 to 1806—that the name "Holy Roman Empire" is, if less fitly, more commonly applied.

(4) 962-1054. SUPREMACY OF THE EMPEROR

It was an evil day for Italy—Germany—the world: that day when Mayor Pepin descended from the north,

bestowed on the Pope his first temporal dominions, and inaugurated that connexion between Roman Papacy and Teuton monarchy, which led to the re-establishment of the Western Empire under Frankish Charlemagne and German Otto, and the various efforts at the continuation of that Empire which succeeded it

Evil for *Italy*: whose land, in the long struggle between Pope and Emperor, was perpetually overrun by the imperial armies; remained, for generations after that, distracted by the Papal and Imperial factions of Gwelf and Ghibeline; became presently the cockpit of rival nations—Spain, France, and Austria—in their endeavour to re-establish Empire; and, even when the Empire itself had ended, continued to groan under the yoke of Austria and Spain—attaining her freedom only in 1861 and her unity only in 1870.

Evil for *Germany*: which, during the repeated absences of her monarchs in Italy, became a collection of independent dukedoms; was unable presently, owing to this pre-occupation, to share in the colonial expansion of rival powers; and, when other countries had long become corporate states, obtained some form of political union—even then at the cost of political freedom—later even than Italy by a decade of years: not till 1871

Evil for the *world* at large: whose other civilised nations, while all this inner rivalry for Empire was going on, were meantime, along with the main protagonists, left exposed to the outer and ever-advancing terror of the Turks, were themselves, by and by, as international relations in Europe became more involved, drawn more and more into the vortex of the imperial struggle; and with each new phase of the struggle—the Hapsburgs, the Bourbons, Napoleon—were troubled with a new menace:

a menace lasting, with the growth of Hohenzollern power, to the present day.

And all this, because Rome was—what she had been; because the Teutons had conquered Rome; because Rome had never fallen at all.

History knows of no such bundle of anomalies as the "Holy Roman Empire." In theory, it covered the whole of Christendom; in practice, it included certain German states and the northern half of Italy. In theory, the monarch, even the ordinary freeman, of any Christian country—Spain, France, England—was eligible for the imperial dignity; and potentates of all three countries were at different times proposed. Charles of Valois, Alfonso of Castile, Richard of Cornwall all received votes—the last two even partially sharing the imperial dignity in name (see p. 118, note): Edward III of England was actually elected, but his Parliament would not allow him to accept. The Emperors were in reality all drawn from German speaking peoples, and from only a few families of these. In theory, any country in Christendom could become an electorate; in practice, the Electors—first five in number, the dukes of the new-created German monarchy; then seven; ultimately nine—were all attached to German soil;¹

¹ The Electors were at first the five Great Dukes of Franconia, Saxony, Bavaria, Swabia, Lotharingia. By 1356, the time of the *Golden Bull* (p. 134), they had become seven in number: of whom three were clerical, four temporal: 1, the Archbishop of Mainz; 2, the Archbishop of Trier; 3, the Archbishop of Cologne; 4, the King of Bohemia; 5, the Count Palatine of the Rhine; 6, the Duke of Saxon-Wittenberg; 7, the Margrave of Brandenburg.—Later, was added, 8, Bavaria (which had meanwhile lost its vote). Ultimately, 9, Hanover: hence the anomaly of a British King, one of the Georges, crossing the Channel to take part in the election of a German Emperor.—The electoral vote went with the land.

The title "Elector" was more highly valued than that even of "King." It is curious that Austria, first a margravate, then a duchy, then an archduchy, never succeeded, in spite of her long tenure of imperial power, in attaining the coveted dignity of an Electorate.

and the imperial power—in theory, elective—was usually, in practice, passed on from father to son until the dynasty died out.—The Electors were German; the Emperor was German; the Empire was in essence a German Empire—with the elective and hereditary principles combined. The whole thing was “made in Germany.”

It was only in their fugitive connexion with Italy, their vague alliance with the Papacy, their sentimental presidency of Christendom, that the “Holy Roman Emperors” were more than their immediate predecessors had just become—German monarchs. And this connexion between German monarch and Italian Pope involved other anomalies. The *Pope* was now not one person but two. He was spiritual head of Christendom, but he had also become, by the gift of the Exarchate, a temporal prince in Italy: and the last character—emphasised presently by further gifts of Papal States, and later by the territorial ambitions of certain Popes—reacted upon the first, and ultimately altered the whole nature of the Papacy

If the Pope was two persons, the *Emperor* was even three. He was, by birth, feudal Duke of his own tribal district, he became, by the choice of the Electors, feudal King of Germany; he emerged, on coronation by the Pope, as temporal head of Christendom. And here, too, the various characters reacted on one another: the tribal Duke came, from being Christian Emperor and German King, to be something else, which was neither—German Emperor.

But the biggest anomaly of all lay in the relation of these two composite personalities, *the Pope and the Emperor*, with one another. In theory, they were equal, and formed one united whole—the Pope representing the spiritual, the Emperor the temporal head of the Empire:

a relation illustrated by a mosaic in the Lateran depicting Charlemagne's coronation, where St. Peter is represented holding the keys, with Pope and Emperor kneeling before him. In reality, they were never equal—sometimes one was superior, sometimes the other; they rarely worked together—the Emperor demurred to the growing temporal ambition of the Pope, the Pope did not scruple, in reply, to stir up the rival Dukes against their feudal lord, and the division between them grew wider and wider as time went on.

It was, indeed, not likely that this strange union of spiritual and temporal, of religious and feudal, of Roman and Teuton, each so complex in itself, each so opposed in interest to the other, and each so penetrated with anomalies, should last long without difficulties. And difficulties began from the very first. But for a hundred years, during the reign of seven Emperors (the five Saxon monarchs, and the first two of the Franconian, or Salian, dynasties), while the Emperors, in spite of certain lapses, were strong enough to be masters of their own Electors and to control the Popes themselves, the Holy Roman Empire, re-established by Otto, if neither very "Roman" or very "Holy," remained, at any rate, an Empire.

How *Otto I.* himself (936-973), as King, had subdued the rival Dukes, extended the German kingdom eastward, and required the imperial crown from the Pope, has been mentioned: as Emperor, he repeated his descent into Italy, and set up one Pope after another. With *Otto III.* (983-1002), his grandson, came a partial lapse. He confined his attention and his presence to Italy: where he too nominated successive Pontiffs, and reformed the Papacy, but thereby he unfortunately paved the way

for the power of Hildebrand. In Germany, he added nothing to previous conquest, he had little hold of the Electoral Dukes, and when, at his death, the direct line of Otto ended, it was at the invitation of the nobles and the Pope together that *Henry II.* (1002-1024), great-grandson of Henry the Fowler, succeeded to the throne. Henry acquired feudal control of Hungary by bestowing his sister's hand and the title of "King" upon its ruler.

In the reign of *Conrad II* (1024-1039), first of the Franconian Emperors, Burgundy¹ was included in the Empire under the name of the "Kingdom of Arles." But it is with the accession of **Henry III.** (1039-1056) that the Empire touched the height of its power—a height to which, at home, even Otto had not reached. He inherited, now in full, the old Middle Kingdom, in addition to his own kingdom of the East. The duchies he allowed to remain vacant or filled with his relatives; retaining Franconia and, for some years, Swabia in his own hands Hungary he reduced almost to the condition of a German province. In Italy he not merely appointed the Pope, but acquired from the Synod the right of such appointment. He was all-powerful at home and abroad.

After his reign came the reaction. His high-handed treatment of the Papacy led at once, with his death, to a Papal revolt, for which the unhappy policy of Otto III, by strengthening the Popes, had already prepared the way.

¹ The name "Burgundy" covered, at different times, very different districts the dukedom of Burgundy, the kingdom of Burgundy or Arles—somewhat wider in extent, widest of all, a realm which, with the addition of a "county" further north, known also as "Upper Burgundy," included almost the whole of the old Middle Kingdom of the Franks. (See Appendix to Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*, where ten or twelve different meanings of the name are given.) Cf p 59, note, and p. 133.

(5) 1056-1254: TRIUMPH OF THE PAPACY

The two centuries which follow, covering the reigns of the two last Franconian Emperors and the whole of the third or Hohenstaufen line, form a period in which the Empire, in its first phase, went rapidly down the hill to a disastrous end: a period rendered pathetic also by the fact that the power which overthrew the Emperors was the power which the Emperors themselves had raised, and by the fact that one of the Emperors, who suffered most from it, attracts admiration by his chivalrous qualities.—The chief points at issue between Pope and Emperor were the Emperor's right to nomination of the Pope, the Pope's right of "Investiture" in Germany, and the feudal position of the Papal States in Italy.

(a) *Nomination and Investiture (Franconian Emperors)*

Henry IV. (1056-1106), son of Henry III, of the Franconian dynasty, was a child when he succeeded to the throne—and to difficulties which would have tested a full-grown and able man. The Papacy, at the prompting of one *Hildebrand*, at once took advantage of his minority. The right of the Emperor to nomination of the Pontiff had long been looked on askance in Italy; and Henry IV.'s attempt to settle the difficulty for all time in favour of the Emperor failed promptly of success. In 1059—three years after the boy Emperor's accession—this right was practically nullified by the recognition of a regular body in Italy, which by and by (1179) materialised into the "College of Cardinals," for the selection of a Pope.

The next dispute rose in 1075 Henry had now reached manhood, but it was a manhood marred with vice; and

Hildebrand had now become Pope as **Gregory VII**. The question at issue was **Investiture**, the right of a layman—the Emperor—to bestow benefits on the clergy. Bishops and abbots now held half the land in Germany; and for the Emperor to lose this right meant that he lost feudal control of half his kingdom. But Henry had a strong antagonist to deal with, the Saxons were jealous of his sovereignty; Germany generally had been alienated by his vicious life. The result was the famous scene of an excommunicated Emperor doing bare-foot penance through two winter nights in the courtyard of Canossa,¹ a castle belonging to the Pope's friend, Matilda of Tuscany; and the long "War of Investitures" (1075-1122), concluded only when both Henry and Hildebrand were dead, in the reign of Henry V, 1106-1125, by the "Concordat of Worms"—a compromise which left the Papacy practically victorious, and the nobles and clergy much increased in power.

Lothar II. (1125-1138), who succeeded Henry V., was of the House of Saxony and a minion of the Pope. This monarch did much to extend German possessions to the north and east. But the circumstances of his succession and even the prosperity of his reign only marked further the progress of the triumphant Papacy—By marrying his daughter to the Duke of Bavaria he unwittingly prepared the way for still further triumph of the Popes.

(b) *The Hohenstaufens and the Papal States*

With the Franconian Emperors the points at issue had been Nomination and Investiture; with the accession of

¹ The incident was to be recalled in after years, when the New German Empire had been established, in 1871, by Bismarck's utterance "We will not go to Canossa"

the third great dynasty, the Hohenstaufens of Swabia, another point becomes prominent—the question of the **Papal States**. And here also the Papacy showed its ability to seize occasion and exploit dissensions in Germany to the profit of the Papal cause.

The accession of the Hohenstaufens (so called from the Swabian castle of Staufen) was strongly opposed by the Saxons and Bavarians now united, by Lothar's action, under one rule; and a war ensued with the latter, known in history as the war between the "**Gwelfs**" (or Welfs, the Bavarian Ducal family) and the "**Ghibelines**" (named from Waiblingen, another Hohenstaufen castle in Swabia). *Conrad III.* (1138-1152), first of the Hohenstaufen Emperors,¹ was troubled throughout by the coalition of his enemies. **Frederick I, Barbarossa**, "Red-Beard" (1152-1190), his nephew, succeeded, by certain territorial concessions, in patching up the feud of Gwelf and Ghibeline at home, as a purely German quarrel—only to transfer it in its larger and more historic form to Italy. This was due to the bequest of a woman already mentioned above, one of the most remarkable figures of her time, and one destined to affect the fortunes of the Empire for several generations.

Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, and the lifelong friend of Hildebrand, had married the son of the Gwelfic Duke. On her death, in 1115, she had left Ancona and Spoleto as a legacy to the Papal See; **Alexander III.**, Pope 1159-1181, now claimed complete control of the whole estate; and Frederick, resenting this loss to the Imperial demesnes, descended, in 1154, on Lombardy. The "**Gwelfs**" now became the party of the Pope and of most of the Italian

¹ It is worthy of note, in passing, that Brandenburg, nucleus of the future Prussian monarchy, was occupied in his reign by Germans as a Mark against the Wends.

cities—the first fighting for the Papal States, the second for freedom from the feudal rule; the “Ghibelines,” the party of the Emperor and of certain cities which he induced to join his cause. The war which ensued ended with the defeat of Frederick by a strong coalition of the northern states, the “League of Lombardy,” at the battle of *Legnano*, 1176; and the “*Peace of Constance*,” 1183; secured at the same time the supremacy of the Popes and the freedom of the Republics: though the strife of Gwelf and Ghibeline long lingered on in Italy after the Imperial forces had been withdrawn.

Frederick’s policy at home was in contrast with his apparent policy abroad. In Germany, he multiplied the nobles of the second rank; he gave municipal rights to many towns. From the first came the “College of Princes”; from the second the Free Cities: both destined to form a Third Order—a bulwark for imperial authority against the encroachments of the Dukes. He died in Cilicia in 1190, on his way to join the Third Crusade: the most heroic figure of the Middle Ages. By the irony of fate, it was, as we mentioned, under Frederick, in whose reign the separation of Papacy and Empire first became practically complete, that the term “Holy” was first added to what had been known simply as “Roman Empire” hitherto.

With the four remaining Hohenstaufens the contest ends. **Henry VI.** (1190-1197), indeed, gaining by marriage the newly created Norman kingdom of the “**Two Sicilies**” (Sicily and Naples) made a valiant attempt to re-awaken the struggle from the south. But *Philip of Swabia* (1198-1208), who followed, had to fight for his crown against the Gwelfic House, and Otto IV. of Brunswick (1198-1215), his successful rival, was none the less forced, as the condition of his coronation, to cede finally to Pope

Innocent III.—another of the powerful Popes—all claims to Matilda's legacy; *Frederick II.* (1212-1250), a prince of remarkable gifts, pressing the claim of Henry VI, his father, to the Norman kingdom, died in the middle of a vigorous struggle with the Papacy, and in the turmoil of the Crusades; and the Two Sicilies were seized presently by a French prince, Charles of Anjou, and then by the Spanish House of Aragon. The death, in 1254, of *Conrad IV.*, last of the Hohenstaufen Emperors (his two successors, Manfred and Conradin, failed to gain the imperial title), marks, after one more fruitless effort, the end of the imperial hold on Italy, and the final triumph of the Papacy.

(c) *The Papal Power*

But it was not only in Germany and Italy—the Inner Empire—that the Popes had been able to express their power. In *England*, the Norman Conquest by William I. was said to have been inspired by Hildebrand—not yet elected Pope; and there was repeated Papal interference with later English kings—with William II. and Henry I. in the matter of the Investiture of Anselm; with Henry II, who had to do penance for the murder of Becket; with John, in the appointment of Stephen Langton; with Henry III. on the question of Papal taxes. In *France*, the action of the Popes had penetrated even more intimately into private life; the French kings, Robert le Pieux, Philippe I., had both been attacked on the point of marriage; Louis VII. on the old question of investiture; Philippe Auguste on the marriage question.

Sometimes for evil, but more often at first for good, the Papal power had extended over the moral, religious, political life of almost every civilised country in Europe:

a power armed with the terrible weapons of **Excommunication**, by which the offender was excluded from all church services, or **Interdiction**, by which the churches of a whole country could be closed; a power assisted by the **Crusades**, (1096-1272) which, practically contemporaneous with this period, were largely organised by the Popes, and directed continually to the advantage of the Papacy; while, at the same time, the **Monasteries**, supported by the Popes, formed outposts of the Papal cause in every land:—a power based on the ignorance and superstition of the “Dark Ages,” and, later, making it difficult for that darkness to disperse, but for a while supplying the guidance of a flickering light.

Three great Popes, *Innocent I* (402-417), *Leo I* (440-461), *Gregory I*. (590-604) had, on the fall of the old Roman Empire, founded the spiritual power of the Papacy; three great Popes, *Gregory VII.* (Hildebrand, 1073-1085), *Alexander III.* (1159-1181), *Innocent III.* (1198-1215), had now, with the decline of the new Holy Roman Empire, refounded that power upon more temporal lines, while extending its spiritual influence over an even wider sphere. The temporal was destined to expand at the cost of the spiritual, the Papal states, begun by Pepin’s gift of the Exarchate in 754, and enlarged by Matilda’s legacy of Spoleto and Ancona in 1115, were presently further increased by fresh territorial acquisitions; and, in the times of the Borgias, three other Popes, *Sixtus IV.* (1471-1484), *Alexander VI.* (Roderick Borgia, 1492-1503. aided by his son, Caesar Borgia, and his daughter, Lucretia Borgia), and *Julius II.* (1503-1513), founder of the modern St. Peter’s at Rome, were to attempt to establish a temporal kingdom in Italy.

Meantime the corruption of the Papacy—due mainly to

this temporal ambition—had begun; and it was under Leo X. (1513-1522), the successor of Julius II., that the Reformation and the final decline of Papal power—spiritual and temporal alike—commenced. The Reformation shook even the Celto-Latin countries to the south—Italy, Spain, France—in their allegiance; a large part of the more Teutonic kingdoms to the north—Germany, Britain, Scandinavia—escaped wholly from Papal influence; in both—even in Roman Catholic France—further revolts were to occur from time to time. But the Papacy never forgot the glories of its old predominance; it still endeavoured, by fishing in the troubled waters of political strife—especially in the struggles of England with Scotland and with Ireland—to re-extend at any rate its spiritual authority; and, when at length, in 1870, four years after the union of the rest of Italy, its temporal estates, long diminished, were finally absorbed by the Italian crown, and the Pope withdrew, in dudgeon, a self-constituted prisoner, into the Vatican, it still sought from there, by priestly intrigue, to recover something of the world-wide power it had lost.

But the end of the present period, 1254, left the Papacy pre-eminent as a spiritual power in the world at large, supported by considerable temporal power in Italy itself: while the Emperor, now entirely dissociated from the Pope—once his “junior partner” in the strange dual business—had lost not merely all his hold on Italy, but control over the rival dukes in his own Germany, which was now quite broken up in separate states—The “Holy Roman Empire,” in anything like its original conception, was at an end.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER V

2. 1254-1437: BREAK-UP OF TEUTON EMPIRE, AND EMERGENCE OF FRANCE

(1) *Change in character of Papacy.*

No longer merely spiritual: externally, now subject to France.

(2) *Rise of France: and her revolt against the Papacy.*

- (a) Capetian dynasty, and the Angevin Empire History after Verdun, 843. English Angevin Empire in France, 1154-1204. Seizure of Sicily and Naples by Anjou, 1262
- (b) Capetians and the Papacy. Transfer of seat of Papacy to Avignon "Babylonish Captivity," 1309-1377.
- (c) House of Valois, and the Hundred Years' War France suffers in Hundred Years' War with England, 1338-1453 (but recovers under Louis XI, 1461-1483. The Italian Wars, 1494-1554).

(3) *Revolt of England and Bohemia against Papal Control*

Wycliffe and the Lollards, 1374, John Huss in Bohemia, 1415.

(4) *Rise and Fall of the Italian Republics.*

- (a) Brilliant period of Republics when freed by Peace of Constance from imperial control, 1183-1350. Gwelfs predominant
- (b) Circ. 1300, with return of Ghibeline lords from exile, Republics fall into power of great families, or of despots—who are aided by the "Free Companies" of mercenaries ranging Italy
- (c) War for pre-eminence between states: from which five states emerge—Milan, Rome, Florence, Naples, Venice.

(5) *Disintegration of Germany*

Not merely is the Emperor separated from the Pope, but the Empire now suffers from results of recent quarrel

- (a) External loss of territory—Italy, Sicily, Naples, and in part Burgundy: the last then lost to France
- (b) Internally imperial power limited by Electoral Meeting of Rense, 1338; Golden Bull, 1356, Leagues of Cities
- (c) Interregnum, 1254-1273: followed by Bohemian and other dynasties

Results · Pope and Emperor now going downhill together

CHAPTER V

2. 1254—1437: BREAK-UP OF TEUTON EMPIRE, AND EMERGENCE OF FRANCE

(1) CHANGE IN CHARACTER OF PAPACY

THE Pope had now overcome the Emperor, and his triumph was followed in Germany by an *Interregnum*, lasting twenty years, 1254—1273.¹ But it was not long before the Papacy began to fall from its high place; and this decline was due to both external and internal causes.

Among the first may be mentioned the ending of the Crusades, which had supplied such an excellent *raison d'être* to Pope and Emperor alike; the increased knowledge of other men and other lands which the Crusades had brought; and the disturbed condition into which many countries had fallen during their continuance. Internal reasons were even more operative: the Papacy was, owing to success, wholly altering in character. Its temporal side had become dominant; the Popes themselves, in the centre of the spider's web at Rome, had grown more

¹ It was during this period that Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso of Castile divided between them the imperial title: though the first was only recognised along the Rhine, the last never entered Germany at all.

corrupt; the monasteries, whose network spread over every land, had become permeated with abuses. At the same time, the Papal claims to interfere in the affairs of other countries were no less exorbitant: though the Papacy, which made them, commanded less respect, and the people, on whom they were made, had become less tractable and more independent

The result was a growing irritation at Papal control, and France, the western part of Charlemagne's old dominions, ever waiting her opportunity, was the first to herald a revolt.

(2) RISE OF FRANCE, AND HER REVOLT AGAINST THE PAPACY

(a) *The Capetian Dynasty and the Angevin Empire*

After the division of Charlemagne's kingdom at Verdun in 843, France, like Germany, remained long in a chaotic state, there were continual wars between the Eastern and the Western Franks, in which the West had, as a rule, the worst of it, and in France, as in Germany, the last Carolingian kings were almost as feeble as the last members of the Merovingian line. In both countries recovery began only with the abolition of the Carolingian dynasty; but France recovered later than Germany and recovered more slowly.

German history, as distinct from the history of the Eastern Franks, had begun with the reign of the Saxon, Henry the Fowler, in 918, and Henry's son, Otto, founder of the "Holy Roman Empire" in 962, had succeeded, before he died, in mastering, more or less, the rival Dukes, in making Germany almost a united whole, and in recover-

ing the southern and central parts of Charlemagne's domain, while he had considerably extended that dominion to the east. French history, as distinct from the history of the Western Franks, began only with the accession of the **Capetian** line under Hugh Capet in 968—fifty years later than the kingdom of Henry the Fowler, later even than the empire of Otto; and even then it ran only in a feeble and troubled stream.

The country itself was still disturbed internally by the strife between king and baron: a strife only partially got in hand by **Louis VI.** (1108–1137), fifth monarch of the line. Externally, most of the kingdom of the Middle Franks was at this time in the hands of Germany; with the accession of *Henry II. of Anjou* to the English throne (1154–1189) and his inheritance in Western France—he received from his mother Normandy and Maine, from his father Anjou and Touraine, from his wife Guenne, Poitou, and other provinces—the English monarch possessed more of French territory than did the French king himself; and France, a little strip of country between the German Empire on the east and the English Angevin Empire on the west, was too weak to interfere in the struggle between Pope and Emperor that was going on to the east of him.—The first Teuton Empire remained unchallenged by France.

(b) Capetians and the Papacy

But the strong reign of **Philippe II. Auguste** of France (1180–1223) and, simultaneous with it, the disastrous reign of *John of England* (1199–1216) dispersed the trouble on the western side. By 1205 nothing of French territory remained to England except the Channel Islands and

Guienne; in 1214 the German Emperor, John's ally, was defeated by Philippe at Bouvines; and in 1216, Louis, the son of the French king, landed, by the invitation of the English barons, upon English soil; while by the end of Philippe's reign, the trouble with his own barons also had been fairly crushed. He was a main founder of the French monarchy. And now the weakness of the Empire at the time of the Interregnum of 1254 provided an opportunity for France to attend to her imperial claims to the East. In 1266, Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX., received from the Pope Sicily and Naples: Sicily, after a massacre of the French, known as the "Sicilian Vespers," in 1282, was acquired by the Spanish Prince of Aragon, but Naples remained an Angevin possession till 1435, when it also went to Aragon. At the same time, St Louis IX. himself, King of France, 1226-1270, sounded the first signal of revolt from the Papacy by the strong assertion of his regal rights.¹

It was, however, under Philippe IV. le Bel that the revolt of France reached its climax. This monarch, in 1301, not merely refused to admit the Pope's claim to temporal authority, but even solemnly burnt the "Papal Bull"—the document which set forth the claim; and, when the Pope replied with an Interdict, seized the person of the Pope himself: a high-handed action, which not even the Saxon Otto had equalled, on his establishment of the "Holy Roman Empire" in 962, and which was only surpassed by Napoleon, on his attempt at the formation of another Empire, in 1811.

On the death of the Pope, a month later, Philippe

¹ The "Pragmatic Sanction," once attributed to St Louis, forbidding the payment of Papal taxes to the Pope, is probably a forgery of later date—St Louis, after a vigorous reign which again left the French monarchy on a new basis, died at Carthage on the 7th Crusade.

secured the appointment of a creature of his own to the vacant chair, and, by the conditions he imposed, practically forced the removal of the Papal See from Rome to Avignon upon the Rhone: where, under the immediate eye of the French kings, it remained for nearly seventy years (1309–1377). This period of exile from Rome, known as the “**Babylonish Captivity**,” was followed by the “**Great Schism**” in the Papacy (1378–1417): a forty years’ interlude of chaos, in the course of which there were, at one time, three rival Popes at once

(c) *Valois Dynasty and the Hundred Years’ War*

The first emergence of France was not of long duration. Sicily and Naples, as has been mentioned, were both lost to the House of Aragon, the first after sixteen years, the other after a century and a half, and in the middle of her triumph over the Popes, the attention of France was once more called to trouble from the West. The three sons of Philippe le Bel—his three successors—died without male issue; and the Capetian dynasty came to an end. *Edward III.* of England, nephew of the three monarchs, claimed the French throne by direct descent, as heir, through his mother Isabella, daughter of Philippe le Bel; and, in English law, there was some justice in the claim. But by the French “**Salic**” Law, succession was invalid through the female line, and the States General of France recognised Philippe of Valois, cousin of the last three monarchs, as their King. In 1338, ten years after the accession of the Valois dynasty, began the long **Hundred Years’ War** (1338–1453) with Britain. in which (1) Edward III. enforced his claim by the victories of Crecy (1346) and Poitiers (1356), and by the “**Peace of Bretigny**” (1360)

recovered for the British crown much of the French territory once owned by Henry of Anjou.

By the end of Edward's reign in 1377 England, indeed, lost almost all that she had gained. But France was now falling upon evil days (2) In 1380 a weak king, *Charles VI*, ascended the French throne; the country was distracted by the strife of the Dukes of Anjou, Burgundy, Orléans, and other princes; and in 1415 *Henry V.* of England, taking advantage of the state of things, renewed the claim of Edward, with even less justice than Edward, to the throne of France. The victory of Agincourt in 1415 once more placed the French at the mercy of England; and by the "Treaty of Troyes," which concluded this second phase of the war, it was agreed that Henry V. should marry the daughter of Charles VI., and on the death of the king, who had for some time been mad, the French throne should fall to him and his successors.

It looked for the moment as if France was once more to become a province of England. But (3) the third and final phase of the great war completely altered the face of affairs. In 1422, Henry VI., a minor, ascended the throne of England, in 1429, *Joan of Arc*, by the relief of Orléans and the coronation of Charles VII., son of Charles VI., at Reims, defeated the English hopes of succession; and, by the end of the war in 1453, the whole of France, except Calais, was free from British rule. Scarcely was the Hundred Years' War concluded, when the "Wars of the Roses" between the Houses of York and Lancaster broke out (1455-1485), and Britain in turn was forced to attend to her own affairs, while France began gradually once more to find herself. The strong and subtle reign of *Louis XI* (1461-1483) settled much of the internal difficulty with the unruly dukes, especially the proud Duke of Burgundy,

and France was presently able once more to look towards the East.—Under his successor, Charles VIII., began the “Italian Wars” (1494–1559) of France with the Hapsburgs, who had meantime succeeded to the imperial throne.

(3) REVOLT OF ENGLAND AND OF BOHEMIA AGAINST PAPAL CONTROL

But France had not been the only country to rebel against the Papacy.

In *England*, owing largely to hatred, after John’s reign, of France herself, who now ruled the Popes, Papal influence was undermined ultimately under Edward III., 1327–1377, by the statutes of “Provisors” and “Praemunire,” which rendered the kingdom, in questions of preferment, tribute, and appeal, less amenable to Rome; while at the same time the clergy, in matters of land tenure, of taxation, of the clerical courts, lost many of their previous privileges, and were brought more within the scope of ordinary law. Immediately afterwards, in the reign of Richard II., 1377–1399 — just after the “Babylonish Captivity,” and during the time of the Great Schism: no doubt, partly owing to this series of disasters—**John Wycliffe** (circ. 1380), with his followers, the Lollards, definitely renounced Papal authority, and, by his translation of the Bible from the Latin of the Vulgate into the English tongue, further lessened the vague power of the Papacy. In this case the revolt was not supported by royal favour, and two English kings in succession, Henry IV., 1399–1413, and Henry V., 1413–1422, tried by the stake and other means to suppress the new creed.

But the Wycliffe movement not merely gained ground in England. It spread across the Channel into *Bohemia*.

where John Huss was burnt in 1415, by order of the Council of Constance, for holding Lollard views. It continued, in spite of persecution at home and abroad, until the Reformation, and may be regarded as the precursor of the Reformation itself.

(4) RISE AND FALL OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLICS

(a) *Their brilliant career after 1183*

Meantime, in Italy itself the course of events had followed roughly the fortunes of the Papacy. Ever since the fall of Rome in 476, Italian history, in spite of some partial union under the Greek Exarchate and the Lombard Kingdom, had been the history of individual cities rather than of Italy as a whole, and, like the cities of ancient Greece, each had developed on its own lines. In the successive invasions of Goths, Vandals, Lombards, every state had had to concert separate measures of self-defence. During the chaos which followed the brief Empire of Charlemagne (800-814), there had been little change, except that new invaders, Magyars, Saracens, Normans, took the place of the old; that the various towns had now fortified themselves more strongly; and that each had thereby become more separate from the rest. On to this separate existence had supervened the "Holy Roman Empire" of 962, when, under the controlling mastery of Otto and his first successors (962-1077) the cities of the north were governed for a century by *podestas* appointed by the Emperor from different states, all, like the Papacy, lost their independence; and the various towns were nominally united under the Teuton Empire—though still, in reality, continuing their individual growth.

But in the long and successful struggle of the Pope against the Emperor (1077-1183) many of the Italian cities had begun already to emerge, some of them—Milan, Pavia, Verona—stimulated by conflict with the imperial power; others—Pisa, Genoa, Venice—assisted also by the naval opportunities of the Crusades, which began during the struggle, one of them—Tuscan Florence—aided further by her headship of the Gwelfic cause. There was even, in the latter half of the struggle, some attempt at combination in the face of the common foe. In 1165, a union of cities, called the “Veronese March,” had been formed against the Emperor. It was followed, two years later, in 1167, by the famous “Lombard League”—the deciding factor of the war. The Peace of Constance in 1183, which concluded the struggle, had not merely marked the final triumph of the Papacy, but had left the cities to the enjoyment of free constitutions, the Ghibelins or imperial party either went into exile, or were reduced to subordinate positions in their respective states, and the Gwelfs, the party of freedom and of the Pope, were everywhere predominant. Milan, head of the League of Lombardy, was the first to proclaim a republic, Florence followed suit, and the movement spread to other cities in the north of Italy.

The two centuries which follow (1183-1350) mark the most brilliant time of the Italian republics. Trade, art, enterprise flourished. The Lombard merchants became famous as money-lenders throughout Europe; and the three balls of the modern pawnbroker’s shop still record the symbol of Lombardy. Florence led the way, first and last, in painting and other forms of art, and the beautiful “florn” was now a general standard of value everywhere. Venice became important as a check to the growing encroachment of the Turks. It was in the middle of this

period that the Florentine *Cimabue*, "father of modern painting" (1240-1302), and his pupil *Giotto*, pointed a new way in art; towards the close of it, that the pro-Ghibeline *Dante* (circ. 1315) composed the first great modern epic, "*La Divina Commedia*," *Petrarch* (circ. 1330), friend of the Colonnas, wrote the first modern poetry of love, and *Boccaccio*, precursor of the modern novel, recorded in his "*Decameron*" the plague of Florence in 1348; as the period was passing, that the Florentines, *Fra Angelico*, *Masaccio*, *Fra Lippo Lippi*, initiated the first beginnings of modern portraiture. Much of this inspiring vigour survived political changes of constitution: art, indeed, culminating presently in the glories of the Renaissance, when to the cultured Italian other European states—even those which were soon to dominate Italy—seemed mere "barbarians," as had the surrounding nations earlier to artistic Greece.

(b) *Cities fall into the hands of leading families, or despots who are aided by the Free Companies*

But the freedom of the cities, like the supremacy of the Papacy, was as brief as it was brilliant: both were only exchanging one master for another, and were destined, after losing their independence at home, to succumb to a fresh domination from abroad. The strife of Gwelf and Ghibeline still divided not merely state and state, but one state against itself; and with the gradual return of the Ghibeline lords about 1300, the cities, exhausted by the strife, fell one by one into the hands of leading families—Ghibeline, or even Gwelf. From the leading families tyrants presently emerged; and the rivalries of the tyrants were by and by to throw the country into the cauldron of war. Italy had been the battle-field of Italian Pope

and German Emperor: she was soon to become the battle-field of Spain and France, and before long of France and Austria. She had recently escaped from her subjection to Germany: she was just undergoing a partial subjection to France; she was in the next period to be wholly subordinate to Spain; and in due course Austria was to have her say.—Ultimately she was to be divided between the three, and to suffer from the contentions of a triple rule.

Here also **Milan** led the way, and once more the fate of Italy was to turn on her. Both Charlemagne and Otto had been crowned at Milan with the iron crown of Lombardy. She had been the first to declare a republic: she was now the first to succumb to despotic rule; and it was through her action finally that Italy was once more to be enslaved. As early as 1277 the family of *Visconti* had become predominant in Milan; in 1395 Galeazzo Visconti assumed the title of Duke; and henceforth the republic became a Duchy: the Ducal power passing to the *Sforza* family later on. Similarly Verona fell under the control of the *della Scalas*; Ferrara of the *d'Estes*; Rimini of the *Malatesti*; Bologna of the *Bentivoglios*, Rome herself of the *Orsini* and *Colonna*—the rule of the *Borgias* was yet to come. Many of these also became tyrants, especially in the Papal States.

As Lombard Milan had been the first to fall, so Tuscan Florence was the last. The government of the city lay with certain guilds or crafts—the “*ciompi*” (brethren of the wool-trade), the “*medici*” (doctors), and others. About 1251 the *Medici* rose to prominence; their power increased under Salvestro de Medici (1378); it reached its height under Cosimo de Medici, “Father of his country” (1420–1464), and his grandson Lorenzo the Magnificent (1469–1492). Expelled from the city in

1494, the Medici re-established their authority in 1530; and from 1569 to 1737 they became hereditary Grand-Dukes of Tuscany. But at the close of the present period, Florence was still, at any rate in name, a republic.

The case of Venice and Naples was peculiar. Venice, founded by Aquileian and Paduan refugees from Attila's invasion in 452, and consisting at first of a loose federation of island-villages, had never been really absorbed into the Empire, and her history, owing largely to her position, had always looked eastward, leaving her to the last somewhat apart from the rest of Italy. Since 697 she had been controlled by an elective "Doge" or Duke: who, after 1173, was assisted by an oligarchic council. In 1279 the council was closed to all but a few noble families, and in 1310 became itself in turn overruled by a secret council of Ten—the famous *Signory*, while the Doge became little more than a figure-head: a position much like that of the Ephors and the kings of Sparta. Venice had long been under an oligarchy: the oligarchy had now merely become more close. Ultimately, at the union of Italy under Savoy in 1861-1866, Venice—except for the Papal States themselves—was the last state included.

Like Venice to the extreme north, so Naples, to the extreme south, had only been on the fringe of imperial rule. Her history throughout was connected with that of Sicily. When Charlemagne in 800 wrested northern Italy from the Byzantine Emperor, Naples and Sicily still remained under Greek control—a control presently shared by Saracen invaders from Africa in 828. Then had come the Normans, 1058-1131, turning out Greeks and Saracens alike, and forming of Sicily and Naples the "Kingdom of the Two Sicilies." For a brief period, 1194-1266, it was attached to the German Empire by claims of marriage

with the Norman king (p. 110). In 1266 it had been seized by Charles of Anjou. But the French had been expelled from Sicily in 1282: they were to be expelled from Naples also in 1435; and by the close of the present period both Sicily and Naples were in Spanish hands. They were to remain so, with certain vicissitudes, till the final *dénouement* in 1860.

But peculiarity of position and constitution saved neither Naples nor Venice from the vortex of Italian strife. Norman Naples, for instance, had promptly entered the arena by declaring in favour of Gwelfic Rome. And, meantime, the other cities were passing from republic to despotism; the terms Gwelf and Ghibeline were gradually losing their original meaning; any state would become either, in order to gain advantage over another state, even papal Rome herself was at one time Ghibeline.

And now, with the establishment of the despots, a new element was also creeping in. The strife came to be conducted no longer by citizen soldiers, but by bands of mercenaries, known as *condottieri* or **Free Companies**, who, "hiring" themselves out to the highest bidder, sometimes betraying their employer, often making war upon their own account, were for many years a curse to Italy. Beginning under a German called Werner about 1340 at Naples, where they were employed in a dispute for the throne, they moved northwards, on the settlement of that dispute. The *Great Company*, now the most famous of them, was broken up by Florence in 1359. But the end of the first phase of the Hundred Years' War between France and England, in 1360, let loose on France and Italy other *Grand Companies* of mercenaries, of whom the most famous was the *White Company*, under Sir John Hawkwood—a band employed first by Pisa against

Florence, then by the Pope against the same city, and lastly by Florence herself against the Pope. In the present period the mercenaries were mostly foreigners: later, about 1480, Italian companies also came to be employed. The best known of these was the *Company of St. George*.

(c) *The Five Great States. Milan, Rome, Florence, Naples, Venice*

The result of all this chaos of contention, change of government, and employment of mercenary troops, was the gradual absorption of the lesser by the larger states. Siena and Volterra had already fallen to Florence, at the beginning of the period, in 1254; Pavia fell early to Milan, about 1320; Pisa, crushed first by Milan, fell subsequently to Florence in 1406; Genoa, humbled by Venice, fell in the end to Milan, Verona and Padua fell to Venice in 1402; Bologna and Ferrara, both captured by Milan, went finally to Rome. Ultimately, out of the long struggle five great states emerged: each of which in turn had threatened to dominate the whole of Italy, and ended as capital of a separate district.

The Republic of **Florence**, at the zenith of Gwelf success, had been supreme for several years after 1254, her "Year of Victory": she still, in spite of the attacks of Ghibeline lords and Free Companies, maintained a nominally free constitution under the Medici: she was left practically mistress of Tuscany. The Duchy of **Milan** in the times of the tyrants, headed the Ghibelines; she became, from 1350 to 1400, under the Visconti, mistress of almost all northern Italy; she ended by being queen of Lombardy. The Kingdom of **Naples**, in spite of the loss

of Sicily in 1282, gained such power in 1402¹ under the Angevin King Ladislas as to threaten both Rome and Florence, and passing, like Sicily, to the Spanish House of Aragon in 1435, became once more, as a Spanish state, the "Kingdom of the Two Sicilies." The Oligarchy (so-called "Republic") of **Venice** had grown in power and territory since her conquest of Verona and Padua in 1402; from 1480 to 1492 she was a standing menace to the three states already mentioned—Naples, Milan, and Florence: ultimately, she was left in isolated possession of a wide domain in north-eastern Italy.

Lastly the Papacy of **Rome**, after the French revolt against her spiritual headship in Christendom, and the disastrous happenings of the fourteenth century—the Babylonish captivity of 1309–1377 and the Great Schism of 1378–1405—presently, under Pope Nicholas V. (1447–1455), took her place as one of the five great temporal states of Italy. Later on, under Pope Alexander VI. (1492–1503) and his son Caesar Borgia, and their successor, Julius II., she was to add still further to her territorial possessions, and to aim, in the turmoil of the Italian wars, at converting all central Italy into a Papal Principality. But the emergence of Venice and Rome falls later, into the period of the Italian wars.

Such was the position of the five rival states, when the sudden action of one of them threw all five into the cauldron of an alien war, and settled the question as to which of them should be supreme by bringing all alike under a foreign yoke. In 1494, *Ludovico Sforza*, the reigning Duke of Milan, alarmed by a new friendship of the Medici of Florence with King Ferdinand of Spain, allied himself with the Pope of Rome and with Venice, for their mutual safety; then, dissatisfied with the alliance, suddenly invited

Charles VIII. of France, already eager for wild enterprise, to invade the kingdom of Naples which the Angevins had lost in 1435, and recover for the French crown a possession now held by Aragon. The "Italian Wars" which followed between France and Spain—the last presently allied with Austria—devastated Italy for over sixty years (1494-1559); resulted in the immediate subjection of the whole country to Spain, and led to its ultimate partition between the three belligerents, Spain, Austria, and France.

But the outbreak of the Italian wars and the re-entry into Italy of foreign contention come later: the present period, concluding in 1437, leaves the Italian states deprived, indeed, of their internal liberties, and occupied in their petty rivalries with one another, but so far—except for the acquisition of Naples first by an Angevin and then an Aragonese power—comparatively undisturbed by interference from outside. And of these states, five—Florence, Milan, Naples, Venice, Rome—had emerged to pre-eminence in Italy.

(5) THE DISINTEGRATION OF GERMANY

While the Empire on its Papal and Italian side was thus passing from good to bad, on its Imperial and German side it had been passing from bad to worse. The Interregnum of 1254 marks an epoch in the history of the Empire, and from this date its character is wholly changed: it is a different Empire. The change had been creeping in during the last period, but the present period sums up the change. Already, by 1254, Pope and Emperor had drawn apart; already Italy was practically lost to the Empire; already the internal disintegration of Germany had begun. Now, by 1437, the disintegration was to be

made complete; the Empire was to lose still further territory; the separation of Emperor and Pope was to be definitely confirmed: though the decline of the Papacy was producing some sympathy with its Imperial counterpart, and, by and by, the common danger of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and other developments, which threatened both alike, was to cause some personal *rapprochement*, from time to time, between the two.

The loss of territory came largely, as might be expected in the present period, from the side of France. The seizure of Sicily and Naples by the Angevins in 1266 has already been mentioned: though Anjou was deprived of them in 1282 and 1435 respectively, it was not to Germany they went, but to Spanish Aragon. But the "Two Sicilies" had never really belonged to the Empire, and the final loss of all hold on Burgundy was an even greater blow. The name "Burgundy" has many meanings: there was a kingdom, a duchy, a county of Burgundy: in one sense it was a fief of France, in another, a vassal of Germany; in yet another, it was independent of both. The question is too complicated to be dealt with here (see note, p 106). In 1361 the Duchy of Burgundy fell in to the crown of France; and Philip, the French king's son, was the first of a new line of Burgundian dukes. By his marriage with Margaret of Flanders, he reconstituted in the French interest what was practically the old Middle Kingdom of Charlemagne's domain; and from this time forth the Middle Kingdom was annexed, bit by bit, by the kings of France. Shortly afterwards, in 1386, Switzerland, by the victory at Sempach, secured her independence from the Dukes of Austria. Some of these losses were partially and temporarily recovered later: the Emperor Maximilian, for instance, acquired Flanders by his marriage

with Mary of Burgundy. But by the close of the present period, the Empire, to its loss of most of Italy to the south, had added the loss of much that became France towards the west.

If the external losses were considerable, the internal dismemberment of Germany was even more so. During the long struggle of Pope and Emperor, and the repeated absence of the latter on his campaigns in Italy, the dukes and the clergy in Germany had steadily been gaining power. These now finally confirmed their independence of Pope and Emperor alike in the **Electoral Meeting of Rense** of 1338, by which the election of the Emperor by the electors was declared sufficient, without his coronation by the Pope (few Emperors were crowned by the Pope after 1254, fewer still at Rome: the omission of the rite was now recognised); and in the **Golden Bull** of 1356, the "fundamental law of Empire," by which the Electors—whose number had grown from five to seven (see note on page 103), three clerical and four secular—were definitely confirmed in their rights: the Electoral vote going with the land. The Election was to take place at Frankfurt, the coronation at Aachen, old capital of the Franks.—And two fresh elements of disintegration now appear. **Leagues of Cities** were formed for self-protection against the dukes: such as the "Swabian League," the "League of the Rhine Cities," and one, formed also for trade purposes, the famous "Hanseatic League," with Lubeck at its head; these were the outcome of Frederick Barbarossa's policy, referred to above (p 110)· while "Associations of the Smaller Nobles" were formed for self-protection against both the cities and the dukes.

By the end, therefore, of the period which closes in 1437, the Empire, in both its spiritual and temporal

aspects, had sunk very low indeed. It is curious that, in the course of this period, the germs of what were really two other Empires were sown. In 1273, just after the end of the Interregnum, Rudolf I., founder of the Austrian House of Hapsburg, was chosen Emperor, and in 1415, towards the close of the period, the first Hohenzollern became Elector of Brandenburg, forming the nucleus from which the Prussian Empire later on emerged.

The Interregnum, 1254-1273, was followed by a succession of various dynasties, concluding with four Emperors, 1347-1437, of the Bohemian House of Luxembourg, of whom Charles IV., the "Father of Bohemia," was the author of the famous "Golden Bull"; and it looked at one time as if from Bohemia might come the foundation of a new Empire. In 1437, however, another Hapsburg of Austria was elected, and from 1437 to the end of the "Holy Roman Empire" in 1806, Hapsburgs of Austria continued to hold the imperial throne.

But it was to a very different "Holy Roman Empire" that they succeeded: an Empire dissociated practically from the Papacy, curtailed externally to the south and west, and composed internally of a bundle of semi-independent states.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER VI

1437-1648. SECOND TEUTON ATTEMPT HAPSBURG AUSTRIA AND SPAIN (REFORMATION PERIOD)

• The Hapsburgs of Austria.

(1) 1437-1493: *Rise of Spain*

- (a) Entry of England, France, Sweden, Russia, the Turk—Spain
- (b) Spain . union under Ferdinand and Isabella ; American Empire ,
junction with Austria
- (c) (Conquest of Italy by Spain in Italian Wars, 1494-1559)

(2) 1493-1514: *the Renaissance (Maximilian).*

- (a) Low state of Hapsburg Empire under Frederick III 1440-1493
- (b) Causes of Renaissance invention of printing , fall of Constantinople discovery of America
- (c) Renaissance in Italy . 1350-1450, 1450-1550, 1550-1650
- (d) Renaissance in France, Spain, Germany, England.
- (e) Maximilian and Renaissance ; Hapsburg marriage policy

(3) 1519-1556: *the Reformation (Charles V)*

- (a) Statement of problem.
- (b) Causes of Reformation forerunners of the Reformation in France, England, Bohemia , effects of Renaissance , temporal Papacy , sale of Indulgences
- (c) Revolt of Germany—Luther, 1517 , Schmalkaldic League, 1547 , Peace of Augsburg, 1555 Failure of Charles V to check Reformation

(4) 1556-1618 *Spread of Reformation (Philip II of Spain).*

- (a) Division of Hapsburgs into Austrian and Spanish , of Protestantism into German and Swiss, Lutheran and Calvinist
- (b) Reformation in France, England, Scandinavia
- (c) Philip II and the revolt of the Spanish Netherlands.

(5) 1618-1648 *Thirty Years' War ending Reformation*

Begins on question of Bohemian throne , the Catholic League & the Protestant Union
 All Europe drawn in Questions involved 1 Protestant & Catholic ,
 2 Princes & Emperor , 3 Bourbon & Hapsburg
 Peace of Westphalia, 1648 , triumph of Protestants, Princes, Bourbons
Results Decline of Spain and Austria, and practical end of Hapsburg power in Europe

CHAPTER VI

1437-1648 SECOND TEUTON ATTEMPT HAPSBURG
AUSTRIA AND SPAIN (REFORMATION PERIOD)

THE HAPSBURGS OF AUSTRIA

AUSTRIA and the Hapsburgs are so intimately connected with each other, and have, together, so large a bearing on the story of the Empire from this time, that a preliminary word about both will not be out of place.

Austria (viz *Oester-reich*, or "East Realm"), as we mentioned, began as a "Mark," or Frontier-State, established circ 800 by *Charlemagne* against the Avars; but, like most of his Empire, had gone to pieces after his death. and it is rather from its re-establishment by *Otto* in 955 as a Mark against the Magyars that Austria began. It formed from the first a meeting-point of different races: Teutons of Bavaria—it was, indeed, long known as the "Bavarian Mark"—on the West, Turanian Magyars of Hungary and Slavic Czechs of Bohemia on the East; and a consequent intermixture of nationalities has characterised the Austrian Empire through all time.

In 976, *Otto I* appointed *Leopold* of **Babenburg** as "Margrave," or ruler of the Mark, and he and his family governed the Mark successfully for nearly three centuries,

till the extinction of the line During the Babenburg period, the Mark was made a Duchy in 1156 (it was not till 1453, in Hapsburg times, under Frederick III., that it was converted into a Arch-Duchy); and "Lower Austria"—the original foundation—had, with the addition of "Upper Austria" and outlying districts on both banks of the Danube and with the settlement of Vienna as its capital, already become an important part of the Empire: when, in 1246, the last of the Babenburgs fell fighting against the Hungarians, and the Duchy was seized, with the Pope's approval, by *Ottocar, King of Bohemia* (1246-1276). It is at this point that the Hapsburg family appear upon the scene.

The Hapsburgs take their name from a castle in Swabian Switzerland, "Hawk's Eyrie," and had in the course of a century come to hold a kind of stewardship over the Forest Cantons of Switzerland, when in 1273 *Rudolf I.*, "First Founder" of the House of Hapsburg (Albert II, 1437, is accounted the "Second"; Maximilian I., 1493, the "Third"), was elected Emperor. His election was disputed by Ottocar, the papal favourite, and a war ensued between the two monarchs, which ended in the conquest of Austria by Rudolf. In 1282—a date important in Austrian history—he bestowed certain districts of Austria on his son **Albert I**; and the transference of the Hapsburg headquarters from the Rhine to the Danube was the result. Austria has been in the hands of the Hapsburg family from that day to 1918.

Albert I.—subsequently Emperor—was an oppressive ruler; and his appointment of bailiffs in **Switzerland**¹ led, in the time of his son and grandson, to a successful revolt

¹ Switzerland—the Helvetia of Roman times—had formed part of the Empires both of Charlemagne and Otto being included half in Burgundy and half in Swabia. It takes its name from *Schwyz*, a canton which played a prominent part in the revolt against Albert I. After the Swiss

of the Forest Cantons at the battles of Morgarten (1315) and Sempach (1386). But this loss of their native country served to identify the Hapsburgs still more with Austria, and was soon compensated, through marriage as much as conquest, by the acquisition of fresh territory in the neighbourhood of their adoptive land. Carinthia, Carniola, Tyrol, Istria, Trieste were annexed in turn, mainly under Duke Rudolf IV. (1356-1365). But it was the accession, in 1437, of **Duke Albert IV.** (as Emperor Albert II.) which began the Austrian domination—also through marriage—of Bohemia and Hungary, just at the time of Bohemia's imperial power, and which inaugurated the long line of Hapsburg Emperors—destined to last till the end of the Empire in 1806.

(1) 1437-1493 : THE RISE OF SPAIN

(a) *Entry of other countries on to the arena*

It was not merely to a different Empire that the Hapsburgs were succeeding, but a different Empire in a changing world. While Pope and Emperor, Italy and Germany, had been busy with their own contention, breaking up separately, and then going downhill together, other states had been coalescing, materialising, emerging—states destined, many of them, to be drawn into the main current of the imperial struggle, many of them to supply important tributary streams. Still more, the world, as a whole, was becoming emancipated from the yoke of ignorance and superstition: the darkness of the Middle

had freed themselves from the Swabian Hapsburgs in 1386, their freedom was threatened in 1477, by the Burgundian nobles on the other side; the threat was evaded; and, by a great coalition in 1499, Switzerland made herself practically independent of both Burgundy and Austria

Ages was beginning to melt into the light of modern times.

To the West, *England*, released now from her claims on French territory by the cessation of her long Hundred Years' War with France (1338-1453), and emerging presently from the Civil War of the Roses (1455-1485), was soon to form a united kingdom, under the strong rule of the Tudors (1485-1603): instinct with maritime enterprise, and ready for that colonial expansion, which, later, developed into the British Empire abroad. *France*, freed from the same long war, was completing the collection of her scattered states under one rule, and turning her attention eastward once more: she was presently to make a second bid for Italy. *Spain* was similarly uniting her various petty kingdoms into one Spanish realm, becoming a power in Europe, and amassing a vast empire overseas: she was soon to try issues with France in Italy, and, before long, connexion with the Hapsburgs themselves was to draw her even more fully into the vortex of Italian, imperial, and—presently—religious strife.

Further afield, other powers on the fringe of the Empire were becoming able to play important parts. To the north, *Sweden*, along with Norway, had been subject to Denmark since the combination of all three states by the "Union of Calmar" in 1397; she was, at no distant date, in 1523, to throw off the Danish yoke and enter the arena on her own account: the conclusion of the Reformation struggle in 1648 was largely to be due to her. To the East, the Slav states, *Poland* and *Lithuania*, long drawn together by a new menace, Prussia and Russia, presently combined, by the "Union of Lublin," 1569, into one realm; *Bohemia* had even supplied recently (1347-1437) several occupants of the imperial throne as the ending of the Thirty Years'

War (1618-1648) was mainly the work of Sweden, so Bohemia was to be its primal cause. *Prussia* had begun to move.

Still further to the north and east, *Russia*, biggest of all the Slav powers, had, since her conquest by "Ruric the Jute" in 862, been nominally under a Teuton dynasty. Like other countries, she had begun as a mere collection of petty rival states—Novgorod, Kiev, Moscow and others, and since 1224 had been also labouring under the domination of her Mongol invaders. But the Khanate of Kipchak had now broken up into small khanates (Kazan, etc.); while Russia, under Muscovite auspices, was beginning to coalesce. In the long reign of Ivan the Terrible (1533-1584) she shook herself wholly free of the foreign trouble, the Muscovite kingdom became the Empire of Russia, and with the acquisition of Siberia were laid the foundations of the future empire of Peter the Great. The Magyars of *Hungary*, who had long been waging wars with Austria upon the west, were now, under the patriot John Hunyadi (1446-1453), rendering important service to themselves and others—service which should have received the chief attention of the Emperors, but which the Emperors strangely neglected—by warding off from western Europe the new Turkish peril on the east.

Lastly, the *Turks* themselves, who had already affected all Europe from a distance by causing the Crusades, were now, by their advent into Europe, forming a fresh element in European politics: since 1360 they had been established in Thessaly and Macedonia; soon, in 1453, they were to convulse the world by the capture of Constantinople even after their successes were checked by the combined armies of Magyars and Austrians at Carlowitz in 1699, their presence in Europe was to create an "Eastern Question," continually embarrassing the powers of the West.

(b) *Spain · Union of Spanish Kingdom; New American Empire; Junction with Austria*

In this growing complication of nascent states, Austria, now identified with the Empire, was to become more and more involved by the absorption, under Hapsburg auspices, first temporarily of Burgundy and Flanders, by and by more permanently of Bohemia, Hungary, and Spain. But the dominant note of the time, so far as the Empire was immediately concerned, was the growth of Spanish power. The last period had turned largely on the emergence of France, the present is concerned, even more emphatically, with that of Spain.

The Spanish House of Aragon had already, at the end of the last period, expelled the French House of Anjou from the Kingdom of Sicily and Naples: Spain and France, in their fuller forms, were now to meet once more on Italian soil, and over the same prize, the kingdom of the "Two Sicilies"; and Spain was not merely to confirm her hold in southern Italy, but to extend her conquests to the north, till the whole Peninsula was under Spanish control

But, whereas the rise of France had been coincident with the decline of the Papacy and the final break-up of the first German Empire, and had partly been the cause of both, the rise of Spain was largely responsible for the greatness of the second German Empire—that of Austria. Spain and Austria were presently to become united in the person of the Hapsburg emperor, Charles V.: though Austria retained the imperial dignity, the conquest of Italy was due to Spanish rather than to Austrian forces, it was no less as Spaniard than as Austrian that Charles V. struggled against the Reformation, and when on his death

the Austrian and Spanish Hapsburgs became separated, it was the Spanish king, Philip II, more than the Austrian emperor, Ferdinand I, who continued to champion the cause of the Papacy and Roman Catholicism. The present period deals with the Austrian Empire, but the fortunes of Austria, throughout the period, were bound up with those of Spain; the greatness of Austria was due largely to that of Spain, and with the decline of Spain, Austria also declined.

The conquest of Spain by the Visigoths in the fifth century had been followed by the overthrow of the Visigoths themselves by the Saracen Moors in 711, and the establishment of the **Moorish Caliphate of Cordova** in 756.¹ But it is from the first of these, the Visigoths, driven up into the northern hills by the new invaders but ever waiting an opportunity to return, that the kingdom of Spain was finally to come. The undivided Moorish dominion of Cordova lasted for about 300 years (756–1031), a period of intellectual prosperity to Spain, but towards the end of the period it became weaker and weaker, and ultimately, in 1031, it broke up into several smaller states.

And now a long war, known as the “**Holy War**”—for the Visigoths had long ago embraced Christianity, while the Moors still remained “infidel” and Mohammedan—ensued between the two races; a war in which the Visigoths, despite reinforcements sent over by Moorish fanatics, the Almoravides and Almohades, from Africa, slowly won their way back, bit by bit, on to the southern plains. Already in their mountain fastnesses they had

¹ The date of Abd-er-Rahman's arrival in Spain (p 66) The Ommiad dominion which he established then was not really reckoned as a separate Caliphate till the tenth century. In 1236 Cordova itself fell to the Visigoths and presently (circ 1248) Granada became the leading Moorish state in Spain.

formed little principalities—Asturia (or Leon); Aragon, Navarre, Castile. These, as the war proceeded, had gradually coalesced into two powers, Castile and Aragon. The marriage of Ferdinand “the Catholic” of Aragon and Isabella of Castile in 1469 resulted, in 1479, in the personal union of the two—the kingdom of Spain. Shortly afterwards, with the fall of Granada, the last stronghold of the Moors, in 1492, the Holy War ended in the final triumph of Christianity and the possession by the new Spanish kingdom of the whole of Spain, except for a portion of Navarre, which was ultimately acquired by France.

Three Spanish kings are distinguished as marking the growth, the greatness, and the decline of Spanish power: Ferdinand the Catholic (1474-1516), King of Aragon; Charles V.¹ (1516-1558), grandson of Ferdinand of Aragon and Maximilian of Austria, inheritor of the realms of both, and, after 1519, Emperor of the Austro-German Empire, Philip II (1558-1598), son of Charles V. and husband of Mary of England—though only Spain and its dependencies fell to his inheritance. Ferdinand is—nominally—a Spanish monarch; it is only his grandson Charles who brings Spain into direct relation with Austria; on the accession of Philip and the separation of the Spanish and Austrian Hapsburgs, Spain once more—nominally—sinks back into herself. But both Ferdinand and Philip intertwined themselves into imperial history; and, after Philip’s death, Spain and Austria still went hand in hand until 1700, when the Spanish Hapsburgs were superseded by the Spanish Bourbons, Spain fell under the influence of

¹ Charles I as king of Spain; Charles V as emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. He is known generally as “Charles V.” Ferdinand, his grandfather, owes his title of “Catholic” to the religious zeal with which he prosecuted the Inquisition against the Jews in Spain, and pressed home the “Holy War” against the Mahomedan Moors.

France, and French hatred was concentrated on imperial Austria.

The reign of Ferdinand marks not merely the union of the two great Spanish kingdoms, but the beginnings of Spanish expansion at home and abroad; and Spain now takes her place among the powers of Europe. Ferdinand of Spain, like Maximilian of Austria and Henry VII. of England, aimed at achieving much by foreign marriages—a new factor in European politics, and a sign of the passing of mediæval into modern times. One daughter, Isabel, he married to the heir of *Portugal*; another, the half-mad Joanna, to the heir of *Austria*; a third, Katharine, to the heir of *England*: securing the position of Spain among surrounding states, and, in the case of Austria, succession to the imperial throne. In 1492, Columbus made, under Spanish auspices, his first voyage to *America*, and formed there the nucleus of what—with the conquest of Mexico in 1521, of Peru in 1533, of the Argentine in 1535, all under the next king, Charles V.—became the great Spanish empire overseas. But it was the Spanish conquest of Italy, begun similarly by Ferdinand and concluded by Charles V., which more directly affected the Empire. Already the House of Aragon had secured Sicily in 1282, Naples in 1435. And now the action of Milan in 1494, already mentioned, in inviting France to recover the lost Angevin possessions in Italy, resulted in a new challenge to Spain, and in the outbreak of the “Italian Wars” between Spain and France. (See *sup* pp. 131, 132).

(c) *Italian Wars, and Conquest of Italy*

The **Italian Wars** (1494–1559) fall roughly into three periods. (1) *The first, 1494–1498*, comprised a brief contest

between **Charles VIII.** of France and the **King of Naples**, another Ferdinand: it had little result. (2) *The second, 1498-1515*, began with a plot between **Louis XII.** of France and **Ferdinand the Catholic** of Spain for the acquisition of Milan by France, and of Naples by Spain; continued with a quarrel between the two monarchs; ended with the expulsion of the French from Italy, and the acquisition of Naples by Spain. (3) *The third, 1516-1559*, consisted of the lifelong struggle between **Francis I.** of France and **Charles V.** of Spain, a struggle not merely for Italy, but for the imperial crown, for which both monarchs were candidates. Milan fell to the Spanish forces in 1521, Genoa in 1522. Francis was defeated and taken prisoner at *Pavia* in 1525, and abandoned his claims to Italy in the **Treaty of Madrid**, 1526. "All is lost," he said, "but honour." But in the same year he joined a "Holy League" formed by the Pope, Milan, and Venice against Spain. The successes of Charles continued with a change of papal attitude. Milan was finally mastered in 1527, and Rome herself soon followed suit. **The Treaty of Cambrai** in 1529 reasserted the terms of the Treaty of Madrid; and in 1530, Charles, whose imperial dignity had long been recognised, was crowned by the Pope at Bologna **King of Italy and Emperor**. In the same year, 1530, Florence, the great Gwelfic republic, succumbed, after 400 years of freedom, to Emperor and Pope; and Alessandro de Medici, the leading noble in Florence, symbolised her loss of liberty by breaking up the great bell which had summoned her citizens to council in happier times. Of the five states, Naples, Milan, and Florence had been wholly reduced; the oligarchy of Venice and the Papacy of Rome alone retained any semblance of independence.

The struggle was now practically over, but the war

still lingered on Francis I. of France died in 1547; Charles V. of Austria and Spain abdicated in 1556, leaving his Italian possessions to his son, Philip II, king only of Spain. The two great protagonists had left the stage; their successors, the French king, Henry II., and the Spanish king, Philip II., were left to finish off the war, which thus became a war between France and Spain. The question was settled elsewhere—in northern Europe—by the defeat of the French at St. Quentin in 1557, and at Gravelines in 1558, and the **Treaty of Chateau Cambresis** in 1559 left little to France of her Italian claims. Ferdinand the Catholic had mastered southern Italy in 1504, Charles V. had completed the conquest by the addition of the north in 1530; in the reign of Philip II. all Italy was practically in Spanish power.

There had been many undercurrents in the war: an attempt by Pisa in the first period to gain her independence of Florence; an attempt by Venice in the second to extend her territory to the south; an attempt by the Borgian Popes in the third to create a papal principality in central Italy. One of these issues was destined to remain. The Popes had played fast and loose with Spain and France, but three times Spain had been invited by the Pope to intervene; papal sympathy had on the whole been on the side of Spain, and the end of the war was an alliance between Spain and the Papacy. Spain had already had a long training of religious zeal in the Holy War with the Mahommedans; Ferdinand the Catholic had followed up that war by a cruel Inquisition against the Jews, Charles, in the midst of the Italian wars, had time to employ his energies against the Protestants. Spain had become the bigoted champion of a corrupt Papacy; and the narrow-minded Philip II. was, by and by, to turn the

terrors of the Inquisition against the Reformed religion, to carry his oppression into the Netherlands, and even to transport his orthodoxy overseas in the invasion of the British Isles.

For, while the Italian wars were still raging, other and bigger events were happening in Europe, events to which the Italian wars on the West and the wars with the Turks towards the East formed only a running accompaniment. The Italian wars lasted from 1494 to 1559—the reigns of two Emperors, Maximilian I., 1493 to 1514, and Charles V., 1519 to 1556. With one of these events, the Renaissance, Maximilian was brought face to face; with the other, and even greater event, the Reformation, Charles. It is with these two movements that the period of Hapsburg power and of Austrian, or Spanish, supremacy is mainly concerned.

(2) 1493-1514: **MAXIMILIAN AND THE RENAISSANCE**

(a) *Low State of Hapsburg Empire under Frederick III.*

The long succession of Hapsburg Emperors began in 1437, and with the accession of **Albert II**, Duke of Austria, and King, by inheritance, of Bohemia and Hungary, things promised well. But in the reign of **Frederick III** (1440-1493), second monarch of this period, the Empire touches its lowest point. *Poland* had half gone in the Interregnum 1254-1273; imperial power in *Italy* had ended, for the time being, with the death of Henry VII. in 1313; *Switzerland* had freed herself from the Hapsburgs at Sempach in 1386. Frederick's reign was to see the seizure of the *Duchy of Burgundy* by Louis XI of France in 1477; while Frederick himself was the last monarch

crowned by the Pope at Rome, though one or two Emperors received the papal sanction to their reign elsewhere. From this time it is still more definitely a history not of a Holy Roman but of a German Empire.

One internal success Frederick achieved. Acting in his capacity as Emperor he raised the Duchy of Austria to an Archduchy, in 1453, the year of the fall of Constantinople; but he left Vienna itself in the occupation of Hungarian troops, and by the end of his reign, not merely imperial, but Austrian fortunes had fallen very low indeed.

(b) Causes of Renaissance

But in the fifty years of Frederick's reign yet more important things—things affecting not this country or that, but the whole of Europe—had been going on. The world was fast developing in intelligence; the fuel of revolt from the past was already there; it needed only a sudden light to set the smouldering heap ablaze. The art of war had already been revolutionised by the discovery of **gunpowder**, an invention emanating, it is said, from China, employed by the Moors, as a propellant, in the twelfth century, rediscovered by the English friar, Roger Bacon, in the thirteenth; and perfected by Schwartz, a Franciscan at Cologne, about a century later. It had been used by the English at the siege of Calais in 1347, and during the reign of Frederick came to be regularly employed upon the field of battle.

Yet bigger discoveries were now to revolutionise the arts of peace. The year of Frederick's accession, 1440, was signalised by the discovery that the "**Forged Donation**,"—that supposed deed of gift to Pope Sylvester from Constantine, on which the claim of papal supremacy was

largely based—was really, as indeed for three centuries several enlightened thinkers had suspected it to be, a mere forgery. About 1450 came the invention of **printing** by Gutenberg, in Germany itself, bringing more books into a wider range, in 1453 the **fall of Constantinople**, flooding Europe, by the flight of Greek scholars, with the long-locked-up literature of Greece;¹ in 1492 the **discovery of America** on the West by Columbus, under Spanish auspices, to be followed in 1497 by the voyage of the Portuguese Vasco da Gama round the Cape of Good Hope to India on the East, altering the whole general conception of the terrestrial globe. And the use of the **compass**, discovered about 1302, but perfected by Columbus, pointed the way to further discoveries

Presently, soon after Frederick's death, the position of the globe itself was to be called in question by the statement of **Copernicus**, in 1507, that the earth was not, as had been hitherto supposed, the centre of the universe, but only one of several planets revolving round the sun: an attack on the orthodoxy of the times, which was to be driven home by Galileo (1564-1642), with his telescope, in after years.

All these things combined to emancipate men's minds from the mysterious fetters of the past, to inspire truer ideals in art, sounder philosophy, more individuality of thought; to suggest generally a broader and freer outlook on the world. But they were not favourable either to papal or imperial power; and, in the face of the common danger, there was now some *rapprochement* between Emperor and Pope. Vigorous attempts were made by Frederick's successors, **Maximilian I.** (1493-1514) and

¹ The flight had been going on for a century, as the menace of the Turks, now established in Europe since 1350, became more imminent

Charles V (1519–1556), both acting in concert with the Papacy, to restore the old order of things and recover the influence—that ideal of a world-empire—which was slipping from them. But it was too late. Two new movements, both of them the natural outcome of previous development, and the one leading naturally into the other, foiled their efforts, and in dealing with these new movements, both Emperors, as we have said, were hampered by the long Italian wars with France upon the West (1494–1559), which lasted through both their reigns, and by the threat of the Turkish peril from the East, which both, in their narrow selfish policy, so fatally ignored.

The first of these movements was the **Renaissance** or “Revival” of Art and Learning, the direct outcome of the events which had marked the previous reign, but more especially of the spread of Greek literature with the advance of the Turks in the fourteenth century, a movement originating in Italy, carried from there to France in the commerce of the Italian wars, and gradually finding its way to England and Germany itself, a movement beginning with a revolt from the Schoolmen and an outburst of Classic zeal, ending in impatience at Classical restraint and a tendency to Romanticism, but everywhere taking its colour from the native character of the people through whom it passed.

(c) *Renaissance in Italy*

In Italy it took mainly the form of painting. Italian art, as already mentioned, had begun as early as 1250–1350 with the Florentine artists, *Cimabue* and his pupil *Giotto*, both affected by Byzantine influence. Followed an interlude of imaginative prose and verse spurred largely by the

political struggle of the times, in which *Dante*, the poet of Verona, composed his "Divina Commedia"; *Petrarch* of Arezzo sang his love-songs to Laura, and *Boccaccio*, father of the modern novel, illumined in his "Decameron" the story of the Plague of Florence.

Then, after this first tentative century (1250-1350) came the three great centuries of Italian painting: (1) 1350-1450, the period of Realism and Portraiture—the time of the Florentines, *Fra Angelico*, *Masaccio*, and *Fra Lippo Lippi*; (2) 1450-1550, the period of Idealism and the Renaissance proper, when the spread of Greek culture to the West raised Italian art to its highest height—the period of *Botticelli*, *Leonardo da Vinci*, *Michael Angelo*, *Raffael*, *Fra Bartolomeo*, *Andrea del Sarto*, at Florence,¹ of *Giovanni Bellini*, *Titian*, *Giorgione*, *Tintoretto*, *Paolo Veronese*, *Moroni*, at Venice, of *Correggio* at Parma, *Perugino* at Perugia, and many others elsewhere; (3) 1550-1650, the period of decline and religiosity, from which emerges *Guido Reni* at Bologna (and the poet *Tasso* at Ferrara).

The term "Italian Renaissance" has been applied sometimes to all these four centuries, 1250-1650, sometimes to the final three alone, 1350-1650, sometimes only to the great central century of the three, 1450-1550. Certainly the last—the century following on the fall of Constantinople—was the main period: when art, especially in the time of Lorenzo the Magnificent (1469-1492), centred round Florence—Venice, the state nearest to Greece, playing a glorious second part, when, at Rome itself, papal patronage gave to Florentine artists and writers an inviting home, the Vatican was founded by one Pope,

¹ To this period belong also the Florentine sculptors *Donatello* and *Benvenuto Cellini*, and the Florentine writer *Macchiavelli*, whose "Principe" and "Arte della Guerra" embodied the existing Italian theories of statesmanship and war.

Nicholas V., St. Peter's begun by another, Julius II., and sculpture was revolutionised by the discovery of the Laocoon; and when the enlightened people of *Italy*, as a whole, regarded all encroaching foreigners—French, Spanish, and German alike—as mere barbarians: much as the Greeks of Athens and Corinth had regarded their haughty conquerors from imperial Rome.

(d) *Renaissance in France, Spain, England, Germany*

France—It was in this period, too—the period of the Italian wars—that the French kings, Charles VIII. (1483–1498), Francis I. (1515–1547), and Henry II. (1547–1559) enticed to Paris the artists and scholars of Italy and Greece; that *Rabelais* (1445–1553) wrote his satirical romance of “Gargantua,” and that the “First Pleiad” of French poets—*Ronsard* and others—followed by *Malherbe*, began to sing. But in France the movement did not reach its height till later; it took from the first the form rather of literature than art; in both, it was hampered by over-classicism; and in both, paid less attention to matter than to form. Even the tragedies of *Corneille* and *Racine* and the comedies of *Molière*—all circ. 1600–1650, in the “Golden Age” of Drama which culminated under Louis XIV.—were held in strict restraint by the Aristotelian “Three Unities” of action, time, and space: a formalism already stereotyped in the establishment of the French Academy by Richelieu in the previous reign.

In **Spain**, the other Latin country, the Italian Renaissance, though Spain was the conqueror of Italy, had comparatively light effect. *Mendoza*, indeed (1503–1575), introduced Italian methods in his verse, and, by and by, *Cervantes*

(1547-1575), in his "Don Quixote," tilted, like Rabelais, at the affectations of the times; but literature and art alike were cramped by the narrow bigotry of the Spanish Church, and Spanish painting did not reach its height till the time of *Velasquez* (1559-1660) and *Murillo* (1618-1682).

Teuton Germany and half-Teuton England responded to the Renaissance movement in a way different from their half-Latin cousins, Italy, France, and Spain, and from one another, in accordance with the difference of their characters. In **England**, the Renaissance, developing a little later and more slowly than in France, though the same period marked its climax, was almost wholly literary, but reflected the more virile character of the Anglo-Saxon race, beginning with the sonnets of *Sir Thomas Wyatt* and the *Earl of Surrey* (1500-1550); swelling out in the strong music of *Spenser*, *Marlowe*, *Shakespeare*, *Ben Jonson*, and *Milton* (1550-1650); and falling to formalism only in the studied rhyme of *Dryden* and of *Pope*.

As to **Germany**, the painters of Flanders had become famous under the patronage of Burgundy as early as 1350-1450, especially in the work of the two brothers *Van Eyck*; in the great Italian period, 1450-1550, German art had its representatives in *Albert Durer*, and the two *Holbeins*, father and son; and the next century, 1550-1650, was distinguished by the names of the Flemish *Rubens* and *Van Dyck* and the Dutch *Frans Hals*. But the Netherlands—if these can be called Germany—were concerned with most of these from the first, even purely German art took the cast of the German mind—the more serious semblance of philosophy; and the German Renaissance finds its expression rather in the writings of *Erasmus* (1446-1536), of *Melanchthon* (1499-1560), of *Luther* himself. —In Germany the Renaissance was really the Reformation.

In France, England, and Germany, therefore, the Renaissance reached its zenith at a later date than in Italy, and, as a rule, under a different form—chiefly literary. But the great period of the Italian Renaissance, 1450–1550, marks the first stir of the movement also in other lands; and it was in the very centre of this great period, when art in Italy was at the full summer of its bloom, when the winds had already carried the pollen from its flowers to all the country round, and strange new exotics were already beginning to spring up on every foreign soil, that Maximilian ascended the imperial throne—to find himself staring in wonder at the changed garden of an unfamiliar world.

(c) *Maximilian and the Renaissance*

Maximilian I. (1493–1514) has been called the “Third Founder” of the Austrian House of Hapsburg—he, rather than Albert II., was the real first founder of the new imperial dynasty in Germany. Like Rudolf—nominal founder of the Hapsburg power in Austria and first Hapsburg Emperor—he had to begin by conquering his own kingdom, which he now cleared from the chaos of the last reign, driving out its Hungarian occupants. He had inherited the Archduchy of *Austria*, already increased, through conquest or marriage, by the acquisition of *Carinthia*, *Carniola*, and other neighbouring states, he had acquired *Franche Comté*, *Burgundy*, and *Flanders* by his own marriage with Mary of Burgundy in 1477, and he prepared the way for further extension of territory by three other important marriages. His son was contracted to the daughter of the King of *Spain*, his grandson and grand-daughter to the daughter and son respectively of the King of *Bohemia* and *Hungary*. **Marriage policy**, indeed, was one of the

general signs of the Renaissance period, of the passing of mediæval into modern times, and of the growing interdependence of European powers. Henry VII. (1485-1509), in his marriage arrangements with Spain and Scotland, had already inaugurated this policy in England as an important element in the future diplomacy of British kings. But with the Hapsburgs of Austria it became a fine art: *Bella gerant alii; tu, felix Austria, nube* Maximilian, by these various marriages, brought Franche Comté, Flânder, Hungary, Bohemia, Spain for several generations into the sphere of Hapsburg influence; and, with Hapsburgs as Emperors, it looked for a moment as if the old Empire might be once more renewed in an even wider, if a somewhat different, form.

But no Hapsburg could ever accommodate himself to the tide of times; a movement, which, taken otherwise, might have carried Austrian ambitions to the realisation of all desire, was blindly and narrowly misunderstood; and the Renaissance, bringing with it everywhere a yearning for intellectual freedom and an impatience at the fetters of the past, placed a hopeless barrier in the way of the old imperial designs. When Maximilian died, he had done little, in spite of papal assistance and of his own extended powers, except to increase the territorial importance of his own Austria and of the Hapsburg family. He failed even to raise the Austrian Archduchy to the dignity of an Electorate; and, though the Hapsburgs remained, and were long to remain, on the imperial throne, Austria, with her mixed inhabitants, never really formed an integral part of an Empire, of which she was nominally the head

(3) 1519-1556 : THE REFORMATION AND THE
REVOLT OF GERMANY (CHARLES V.)

(a) *Statement of Problem*

From the yearning for intellectual freedom to the yearning for religious freedom is only a little step ; and it was with this last—the second of the two great movements—that Charles V. (1519-1556), in his turn, found himself confronted in the **Reformation**. Grandson of Maximilian of Germany and Ferdinand of Spain, and armed with the resources of two mighty monarchies, supported also with all the authority of the Papacy, and endowed with strong personal qualities, he was still powerless to stem the tide. The struggle was complicated, on the imperial side, by the Turkish peril, which claimed the attention of Charles both as lord of Austria and Christian Emperor ; by the hostility of the French king, Francis I (1515-1547), first the rival of Charles for the imperial honour, then his bitter enemy through life in the continuance of the Italian Wars ; and by the introduction of Spain, inherited by Charles through his mother, into the heart and heat of the contention. It was also complicated on the Papal side—and it was now the Pope, even more than the Emperor, whom this second movement threatened—by the action of the Papacy itself.

(b) *Causes of Reformation*

The Reformation, like the Renaissance, had had its forerunners, the Elijahs of the Messianic movement. There had already been signs of revolt against Papal authority in France with the Babylonish Captivity of 1309-1377, in England with the Wycliffe movement of

1374-1384, in Bohemia with its sequel, the Hussite trouble of 1415—the first, perhaps, due to opposition to German Emperor as well as Italian Pope, the last two due to the desire for religious freedom from the control of Rome, and forming the forerunners of the Reformation. And a Reformation of some kind would, in any case, have been some time the inevitable result of the Renaissance and the outer causes which had led to that. But its coming was hurried by the inner causes of the altered character of the papal court, and was destined now to take the form of a revolt in Germany itself. The temporal tendency of the Papacy in the last period (1254-1437) had been followed by the plain corruption of the Papacy in the Borgian age (1455-1513)—the climax now came in a particular form of papal corruption—the **Sale of Indulgences** by the next successor to the Papacy, Pope Leo X. (1513-1521). “Indulgences,” or remissions of temporal and purgatorial punishment for sin, had first been issued by Pope Urban III., as early as the end of the eleventh century, to Christian warriors going on the Crusades, and they had often since been granted by other Popes for various other services to the Church, such as gifts of money for the building of St. Peter’s. From this last it was only a little step to their literal sale; and Leo X., crippled by the extravagance of his predecessor and wishing to replenish the papal coffers, took the little step.

(c) *Revolt of Germany*

It was at a town in Saxony that the movement first began which was to spread like fire over the rest of Germany, and ultimately to set all Europe ablaze. In 1517—two years before Charles V.’s accession as Emperor—

Martin Luther, Professor in the University of Wittenberg, protested against the sale of Indulgences, as savouring of simony—the trafficking in holy things; and nailed to the Church door his ninety-five theses, giving the reasons for his act. This “Protest,” made at first in all humility, was converted by papal resentment into an acrimonious opposition; the number of “Protestants” increased rapidly in Northern Germany; and what had begun as a mere question of Indulgences became a general revolt against the authority of a corrupt Papacy, a strong movement for the “Reformation” of the Church.

Pope and Emperor had long been going their own separate ways, but the glamour of their old union in the Holy Roman Empire still remained; during the reign of Maximilian there had been some renewal of friendship in the face of the Renaissance; and the Reformation was equally threatening no less to the Emperor than to the Pope. Charles V., heart and soul, assisted Leo X. and his successors in their efforts to stamp out the new “heresy”: but to no purpose. Luther, indeed, was condemned at the Diet of Worms in 1521, Luther’s doctrines, formulated in the famous “Protest” of 1529, were re-prohibited at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530; and after the death of Luther himself in 1546, the “Schmalkaldic League” of the Protestant Princes was crushed by force of arms in 1547. But the current was too strong. In 1552, when Protestantism seemed finally checked, North Germany, the home of Luther’s teaching, broke out in open revolt; in 1555, the **Peace of Augsburg** recognised the right of each prince to determine the faith of his own subjects; and in the next year, 1556, Charles himself abdicated the throne, conscious that, though he had subjected Italy to Spain, the struggle of a lifetime had been wasted, that not

merely papal but imperial authority had received a hopeless blow, and that the stream was still flowing steadily on to its inevitable end, the open sea.

(4) 1556-1618: SPREAD OF THE REFORMATION IN OTHER COUNTRIES (PHILIP II.)

(a) *Division of Hapsburgs and Protestants*

After the death of Charles V., the Hapsburg line was divided into two branches, the **Spanish** branch, which continued for a century and a half on the throne of Spain (1556-1700), and the **Austrian** branch, with which the imperial power of Germany remained till the end of the Empire in 1806: both Spain and Austria becoming champions of the Roman Catholic faith against its Protestant Reform. And meantime the Protestants also had divided into two camps. A couple of years after Luther's first protest in Germany a new centre of revolt appeared in Switzerland. In 1519, *Zwingli* of Zurich had, independently of Luther, protested against the sale of Indulgences, and, going even further than Luther, had denied the doctrine of "Transubstantiation"—the transference in "Real Presence" of the body and blood of Christ into the sacred bread and wine.

But Zwingli's teaching was presently, in 1536, overshadowed by another thinker, *Calvin*, a Frenchman at Geneva, who went further still, stating his belief in "Predestination," the fore-ordainment of human beings at their birth to eternal reward or punishment, and the resultant absence of all freedom of the human will. And by the time of Charles's death, they were two distinct Protestant Churches, that of the **German Protestants** or

Lutherans, and that of the **Swiss Protestants**, or Calvinists. During the spread of Protestantism through Europe, those countries in which it was adopted under the guidance of territorial rulers took, as a rule, the Lutheran form; those in which the new faith had to struggle against the oppression of princes were usually driven to the more extreme tenets of Calvinism.

(b) *Reformation in other Countries*

In **France**, the Protestants, known there as "*Huguenots*" (German *Eidgenossen*, or "Confederates") were inspired by their countryman, Calvin. The French King, Francis I. (1515-1547), out of hatred to Charles V., at first favoured their cause, and by the end of his reign one-fifth of the nobility were Protestant. But France was at heart Roman Catholic; the religious question soon became mainly an issue in party-politics, and Protestantism lived on French soil for only 150 years. There was a long period of oppression and Religious Wars (seven in all) under Catherine of Medici (1519-1589), her Valois husband, Henry II., and their three sons, Francis II, Charles IX, and Henry III.—oppression culminating, during the reign of Charles IX, in the *Massacre of St. Bartholomew*, 1572. Then came a period of toleration under the first Bourbon king, Henry IV, who had himself been a Protestant and now tried to secure for his old friends their religious freedom by the *Edict of Nantes* in 1598. But, after this brief respite, the Huguenots were crippled, under Louis XIII, by Richelieu's capture of their stronghold, *La Rochelle*, in 1628, and finally suppressed in France under Louis XIV., by the *Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* in 1685.

In **England**, on the other hand, the position which was

to end as Protestant, began as Roman Catholic, and it is interesting to remember that the title "Defensor fidei," Defender of the Faith, which has ever since appeared on the coins of English kings, was first due to Henry VIII's initial advocacy of the papal cause. Here, too, the question was mainly threshed out in the reign of a monarch and his three children. *Henry VIII.*'s revolt from the Pope in 1535 began primarily from personal reasons—his desire, in the teeth of papal injunction, to put away his first wife Catherine of Aragon and marry Anne Boleyn; it continued largely from financial reasons—the suppression of the monasteries and the seizure of their property. The Reformation, thus first established in England by Henry VIII, was confirmed secondly by the issue of the Prayer Book under his son *Edward VI.* in 1549, and, after a bloody interlude of persecution by his daughter *Mary*, was consolidated, in the third place, by the "Act of Supremacy" passed by his other daughter *Elizabeth* in 1559, an Act which finally constituted the "Church of England," and left the English monarch independent of Papal interference, as its head.—The intervening reign of *Mary*, his daughter by the Spanish Catherine of Aragon, her persecution of the Protestants during her lifetime, and the invasion of England, after her death, by her husband Philip II, in the Spanish Armada, of 1588, only served to cement further the position of English Protestantism as a matter both of Church and State.

But here a new element appeared. The Protestants in Britain were somewhat *sui generis*, but they had from the first been affected by the Swiss rather than by the German school; and now the refugees who had fled from *Mary* to the Continent returned home, during the reign of *Elizabeth*, infected with the more extreme doctrines of Calvinism. For some years the struggle of the new English Church

was as much against these extreme Protestants as against Roman Catholicism itself: for the freedom of Protestantism formed a menace to the despotism of Tudor rule.

In England itself the extremists joined hands with the old Lollards of Wycliffe, and were known as "*Puritans*"—men who wished to see the English Church purified from all remnants of the Roman Catholic faith, even the harmless beauties of its services. Some of these, the "*Pilgrim Fathers*," fled to America in 1620, during the reign of James I., and there founded a settlement which proved afterwards to be the nucleus of the United States.¹ In Scotland, where John Knox (1540-1572) preached as a northern Calvin, they were known as *Presbyterians*, denying the authority not merely of the Pope but of the Bishops or Presbyters, and in the reign of Charles I they formed a "*National Covenant*" (1637) to protect their own religion.

Meantime Ireland remained Roman Catholic, except for the plantation of Protestant Ulster by James I. in 1611, and there was a renewal of danger from Roman Catholicism in England under Charles II. and James II. The whole question was only settled on the accession of William III, when, by the *Bill of Rights* (1689), succession to the English throne was secured to Protestants. By the *Toleration Act* of the same year, 1689, freedom of worship was extended to orthodox Protestant sects; but it was many years before a like concession was granted to the more extreme Protestants or to Roman Catholics, of whom the former, under the various names of Baptist, Congregationalist, Wesleyan, Methodist, Nonconformist, etc., now play, along with the latter, an important part in the English state.²

¹ This claim is also made for Virginia, founded 1607.

² The Baptists and Congregationalists were recognised in 1689. The Wesleyan Methodists, who rose about fifty years later (John Wesley, 1703-1791), were less extreme.

The three Scandinavian kingdoms, at this time united under the rule of Denmark, all adopted the Lutheran form of Protestantism; and in all three the religious revolt was accompanied by political change (1525-1560). **Sweden** threw off the Danish yoke and elected as ruler a Swedish noble, Gustavus Vasa, whose successor, Gustavus Adolphus, was presently to be a Protestant champion in the Thirty Years' War; **Denmark** changed her monarchy, and, like Sweden, fought on the Protestant side in the same struggle, **Norway** still remained under Danish control and followed suit.

In the Netherlands the revolt was also of a twofold character: primarily a religious revolt from Rome, then inevitably a political revolt from Spain (1568-1579). **Belgium**, largely Celtic in population, succumbed, remaining Roman Catholic and Spanish; but **Holland**, mainly Teutonic, in 1579 proclaimed at the same time her independence of Spain and her freedom from Roman Catholic control, and adhered to this position in spite of the murder of her champion, William the Silent, in 1584. **Switzerland**, who had long won her political freedom from the Hapsburg family (1393-1499) and had recently, in the efforts of Zwingli and Calvin, done so much for the new religion, was divided within herself (1524-1531); the cantons of Zürich and Berne—the former being Zwingli's home—became Protestant, but the majority—the four Forest Cantons, Lucerne, etc.—remained Roman Catholic. Russia and other Slav states were outside the controversy, and continued to be members of the Greek Church.

As a result, the three Latin countries, *Italy, Spain, and France*, together with *Belgium and Ireland*, remained **Roman Catholic**; the three Scandinavian countries, *Sweden, Denmark, and Norway*, became **Protestant**, of the Lutheran

persuasion, while *England* adopted the more Calvinistic form of the new faith, and this last was carried to its extreme in Presbyterian *Scotland*. The **Empire** itself was divided roughly into two hostile camps: the *Southern* states, headed by Austria and the Emperor, adhering to Roman Catholicism; the Northern, headed by Brandenburg—which was by and by to be identified with *Prussia*—supporting the Reformed religion: the beginnings of an opposition which soon spread to other than religious things, and henceforth grew in intensity from generation to generation, until it culminated in the great duel between Austria and Prussia for the imperial throne and the establishment of the third German Empire under Hohenzollern auspices.

(c) *Philip II. and the Revolt of the Netherlands*

Meantime, the powers that be, sacred and secular, had definitely combined in their endeavour to stifle the growing heresy. The old and more direct method of antagonism had failed; a new and more subtle method was being tried. This in the case of the Papacy is known as the "**Counter-Reformation**"—a movement partly characterised by some self-reform of the Vatican itself at Rome, but largely embodied in the work of the Order of the *Jesuits*, and their dissemination over doubtful provinces, to reassert, by means of education, of persuasive sophistry, secret espionage and unscrupulous denunciation, the beauties of the faith of Rome.

As to the secular aspect of the question, the Austrian Hapsburgs, successors of Charles V. on the imperial throne, continued indeed, for political reasons, to employ repression, but in a hesitating way among other things, they were

just now too much distracted by the long-neglected Turkish peril on the East to give full attention to troubles on the West. The main secular opposition to the Reform movement came at this stage from outside the Empire—from Hapsburg Spain. Charles V. as Spanish King, even more than as Holy Roman Emperor, is largely memorable in history for his purblind and hopeless struggle with Protestantism in its beginnings; his son, Philip II., King only of Spain—now that the two Hapsburg Houses had become divided—is no less notorious for his bigoted and cruel persecution, through all the forty years of his long reign, of the same movement in its great development.—The main opposition came throughout from Spain.

Philip II. (1558-1598), had inherited most of the wide possessions of his father—possessions wider, even after the division of the two Hapsburg Houses, than those of any other European state. His temporal kingdom he was able to increase further by the conquest of **Portugal** in 1580—and thereby Brazil, acquired by Portuguese maritime enterprise in 1530. To him was due the establishment, in 1560, of **Madrid** as Spanish capital, and the building, twenty-five miles from Madrid, of the strange monastery-palace, the *Escorial*. His influence in Europe, already great through his connexion with Hapsburg Austria, he had strengthened by marriage with Mary of England—herself the daughter of Catherine of Aragon; and he had made close league with the Pope of Rome. This preponderant power he could bring at once to bear on lesser states, in pursuance of his religious or imperial designs.

But he did not scruple to work also, and even more, by other means: like a wicked little spider in the middle of its web, he sat in his Escorial, weaving schemes, directing the daggers of the assassin, the intrigues of his Jesuits, the

terrors of the Inquisition. The last, devised by Ferdinand the Catholic against the Jews, was now turned by Philip against the Protestants. There is no doubt that he had at any rate pre-knowledge of the massacre of the French Huguenots at the Feast of St. Bartholomew in 1572, Spanish gold, as well as religious fanaticism, armed the hand of the murderer against William the Silent in 1584—a few years after the emancipation of Holland; many warnings reached England that similar attempts were intended on the life of Elizabeth; it was only the want of success of other means which launched the great Armada on its disastrous voyage in 1588. Plot and plan alike were in vain: the tide of Protestantism continued to rise and spread. As Charles V., the father, had failed, except for the conquest of Italy, in his life's work, so Philip II, the son, except for the annexation of Portugal—and even that was cancelled a few years after its author's death—failed in his even wider schemes.

But the history of Philip's reign turns mainly on the revolt of the **Spanish Netherlands**, which had been left by Charles V. to Spain—a revolt which forms the last stage but one in the Reformation struggle. That revolt was the uprising only of a group of petty provinces; it was in itself primarily a religious revolt; and the revolted Provinces would, at any point in the conflict—even after the death of their great champion—have been willing, if religious freedom had been assured, to acknowledge once more the suzerainty of Spain. But Philip was too bigoted to make any religious concession; it became clear that religious freedom could not be won without civic freedom, and the whole conflict—though Europe gave little help—was really one of European significance. It was not merely for the freedom of Holland—even in religion—that Holland was fighting:

she was fighting for the freedom of Germany, of France, of England.

The murder of *William of Orange* in 1584 had left the Provinces without a head, and torn with internal strife. But the conflict stubbornly went on. Germany, the champion of the Reformation, stood practically aloof; France, under the Valois sons of Catherine de Medici, at heart Roman Catholic, half promised help, dallied, and sent none; even England, now under Elizabeth, sent only a vacillating help. On the other hand, Philip, who fortunately was as mean as he was bigoted, gave meagre support to his generals; the destruction of the Spanish Armada by England in 1588 crippled the power of Spain; and the independence of the Netherlands, under Maurice, William's son, was finally acknowledged in 1609—The next fifty years (1610-1660) marked a glorious period of Dutch maritime enterprise: when Australia was discovered, Cape Colony was settled by the "Boers," and a great city was planted in America—known now as New York, but first called from its Dutch Colonists "New Amsterdam."

In the Netherlands the great conflict had been fought and the same conflict was destined to be repeated, century after century, on the same arena—the Netherlands. Here mainly was fought the question of Bourbon pre-eminence, which closed with the death of Louis XIV in 1715; here, in 1815, was dissipated the great shadow of the Napoleonic menace; here, in 1915, came the climax of the great contest which was to decide the fulfilment or failure of Hohenzollern hopes. Struggle for freedom has ever been associated with the Netherlands—And in, or about, the Netherlands was presently, in 1618, to begin the long contention which determined the failure of Hapsburg ambitions and the final triumph of the Reformation cause.

(5) 1618-1648: THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR AND
THE END OF THE REFORMATION

As the war in the Netherlands forms the last act but one in the drama of the Reformation, so the **Thirty Years' War** (1618-1648) forms the last act of all. Beginning as a small contest for the crown of Bohemia, old home of the Hussites, on which the Hapsburg Emperor, Matthias (1612-1619), tried to force a Spanish and Roman Catholic succession, it developed in the next reign, that of Frederick II, into a world-war between the rival causes of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism—a war, in which almost every European nation became ultimately ranged on one side or the other, and not merely religious but political considerations came before long to play a leading part

The "*Catholic League*" depended mainly on the two Hapsburg Houses of Austria and Spain, and was headed by the Emperor **Ferdinand II** (1619-1637), who tried, in the course of the struggle, to unite Germany under an Austrian military despotism, and incidentally to extend Hapsburg territory westward to the Northern Sea. The "*Protestant Union*," led by Frederick the Elector Palatine, looked primarily for support to England, Holland, and the Protestant Princes of Germany itself, especially to Prussia, but it was championed presently, in 1625, by Denmark, then, in 1630 at the instigation of France, by Sweden, finally, in 1635, by France herself. ← France hated Protestantism, but she hated Austria and the Hapsburgs still more, and, further, had her own axe to grind: the extension of French possessions to the Rhine

For the first twelve years the war went in favour of the Emperor, chiefly through the skill of the Bohemian officer,

Wallenstein. But in 1629 Wallenstein, through the intrigues of the French Minister, Richelieu, was temporarily dismissed; and next year (1630), through the same subtle diplomacy, *Gustavus Adolphus*, King of Sweden, the best general of his time, assumed the Protestant command. Wallenstein was presently recalled, but Gustavus gained a great victory over him at *Lutzen*, near *Leipzig*, in 1632—the “crowning mercy” of the Protestant cause—though the Swedish King himself fell in the fight; and in 1635 France, who had hitherto been working behind the scenes, at length openly entered the lists. In 1637 Ferdinand died. The war, kindled by his ambition, lingered on for eleven years, but its event, with the aid of the French Generals, Condé and Turenne, was now practically decided, and the last five years were mainly busy with attempts at peace.

Apart from the private ambitions of the various powers and their desire for territorial or other gain, the main issues at stake in the war were three: the integrity or continued disunion of Germany itself—a purely German question; the right of Protestants to worship as they liked—a question affecting both Germany and certain other lands; the supremacy of Hapsburg or Bourbon on the Continent—a question in which all Europe was concerned. In each case the question was ultimately decided against the Emperor. The **Peace of Westphalia** (1648), which concluded the war in the reign of Ferdinand III, acknowledged the political freedom of the German Princes, secured the religious worship of Protestants in Germany and elsewhere; and marked the beginning of the ascendancy of Bourbon over Hapsburg.

Incidentally, the independence of Holland and Switzerland was now confirmed—the Empire lost further territory to France and Sweden—*Alsace* to the first, certain posts

on the Baltic to the last, and Protestant Prussia, though she had done little in the war to deserve it, emerged, with the addition of part of Pomerania, considerably increased in strength. Austria, crippled in property, prestige, and power, was left faced by an implacable enemy without—France; and by the growing ambition of an enemy within—Prussia.

After the Thirty Years' War, the Holy Roman Empire, even in its second or Hapsburg form, existed in little more than name, the House of Hapsburg withdrew more and more into Austria, and the details of its rule fall rather within the sphere of purely Austrian history. The Southern states of Germany, indeed, still acknowledged the leadership of Roman Catholic Austria, but the acknowledgment was now little more than nominal, and other states were already beginning to fuse together under the headship of Prussia along the north. Outside Austria the Emperor's power was practically limited to the bestowal of titles on his friends. There was, indeed, a last flicker of imperial dignity in the manifesto issued to the nations of Europe by Leopold II against the French Revolution in 1790, and when in 1806 Napoleon finally destroyed the old Empire, when its Hapsburg Emperor became Emperor of Austria alone, Austria still retained for sixty years her hold on Italy. But the Thirty Years' War ended not merely the spiritual but the temporal power of the Holy Roman Empire, and the events that followed it belong less to the fall of old Empire than to the birth-pangs of a new, less to the decline of Hapsburg than to the rise of Hohenzollern power. The old Empire, founded theoretically on a religious basis and claiming to be the head of civilisation, of Christendom, had already fallen; the new Empire had already begun to rise—an Empire developing on racial, political, military lines, but still

inheriting much of the prestige of the old, and destined also to claim dominion, even to aim at spreading a new "culture," over Christian Europe

Meanwhile, before this new Teuton Empire materialised, the imperial ambitions of Gallic France were once more to provide another interlude. The present period closes with the strong re-entry of France on to the arena of European politics. during the next period, France, with a succession of great efforts at Empire, wholly dominates the scene.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER VII

1648-1815: FRENCH EFFORTS AT EMPIRE · BOURBONS AND NAPOLEON

Review of European situation after Peace of Westphalia no Power
in Europe can move now without affecting every other Power

The Bourbons of France.

(1) 1648-1715: *Louis XIV. and the French menace in Europe.*

Wars 1 Spain 1666-1668. 2 Holland 1672-1678 (height of
French power) Revocation of Edict of Nantes (1685) turns the scale
3 Palatinate 1689-1699. 4 Spanish Succession (Marlborough) 1700-
1714 League of Augsburg against France

Treaty of Utrecht 1713 France secures Bourbon on Spanish throne,
but loses power in Europe · now turns her hopes to Empire abroad

(2) 1715-1789: *Growth of Prussia at home, England abroad.*

(Louis XV.): 5 Polish Succession 1733-1735. 6. Austrian Succession
1740-1748 (Prussian gain of Silesia) 7. Seven Years' War 1756-1763
(British gains in India and Canada)

(Louis XVI) 8 American Independence 1775-1783 9 French
Revolution 1789.

(3) 1789-1815 *Napoleon and the Second French menace.*

Wars of the Revolution, and the emergence of Napoleon

(a) 1796-1807 Rise, reduction of Austria, Prussia, Russia;
Treaties of Lunéville 1801, Pressburg 1805, Tilsit 1807.

(b) 1807-1812 Height, Berlin Decree promulgating continental
system against Britain 1807; Widest Empire 1811; but
fortune turning

(c) 1812-1815 · Fall; Retreat from Moscow 1812; Peninsular War
(1808-1814; b Leipzig 1813; The Hundred Days and
Waterloo 1815

Resettlement of States at Congress of Vienna and Peace of Paris 1815,
end of French peril, formation of German Confederation.

CHAPTER VII

1648—1815: FRENCH EFFORTS AT EMPIRE BOURBONS
AND NAPOLEON

EUROPEAN POSITION AFTER WESTPHALIA: THE HOUSE OF BOURBON

(a) The continuity of History

HISTORY is continuous. We divide it into periods. We speak of the Papal Period, the Period of the Reformation, the Period of the Revolution. But each period is the result of the period which preceded it, and runs into the period which follows: history flows on in one continuous stream. The "Reformation Period," marked with the names of Luther and Calvin, had been anticipated by the revolt of Wycliffe and John Huss: the "Reformation Period" was now over, but many of its issues still remained. The trouble of the Huguenots in France, the Protestant succession in England, the religious division of Germany into north and south, and many other effects of the Reformation period were still to show themselves in the period with which we are now to deal.

But, while it is necessary always to bear in mind the continuity of history, the division into periods is no less necessary. As a traveller through awkward and wooded

country will mount some eminence from time to time and get his bearings, so in history it is worth while to pause from time to time for a moment and take stock.

Such a survey was convenient at the beginning of the Hapsburg period: it is no less convenient now at the beginning of Bourbon influence. For the Peace of Westphalia, with which that influence began, marks an important epoch in European history.

(b) *Europe after the Peace of Westphalia*

After 1648 there was a distinct change in the atmosphere of the Empire and of Europe as a whole. The old protagonists, indeed—Austria, Spain, France—still remained upon the stage. But their relation to one another was altering. The “Empire” was now practically *Austria* alone—an Austria weakened in every way. *Spain*, similarly weakened, was presently to pass from Hapsburg into Bourbon hands. *France*, already emerging once more, was to grow rapidly in importance both in Europe and across the seas—And, meantime, other continental nations also, once parts of the Empire, were beginning to appear on the scene as independent characters. *Prussia*, now virtually outside the Empire in its purely Austrian form, was developing separately on anti-imperial, viz. on anti-Austrian, lines. *Holland*, just finally free of Spain, had already launched out on a career which had important bearing both on international life at home and on colonial enterprise abroad.

Further afield: *England*, with the growth of her foreign possessions—she had already founded her “East India Company” and formed the nucleus of the “United States”—had many points of contact with Spain, Portugal,

Holland, and presently with France: as time went on she was to have more and more. *Sweden*, who under Gustavus Adolphus had already come to the front in the Thirty Years' War, was to add further to her prestige in Europe in the reigns of Charles XI. (1660-1697), and still more of Charles XII. (1697-1718). Lastly, *Russia*, who under Ivan the Terrible (1533-1584) had already shaken off the Mongol yoke and added Siberia to her possessions, was presently, under Peter the Great (1682-1725), not merely to amass a colossal empire, but to change from an Eastern to a Western state, of which account would have to be taken by and by in the councils of European Powers.

And not merely did the growth of each of these states supply a new problem in itself, but any change in the government of them at once created a disturbance not merely in the state concerned but in the whole of Europe. England in 1649, in the cause of freedom, put to death one of her Stuart kings: her action roused the Continent; in 1688, in the cause of religion, she expelled another: the recognition of the Protestant succession in England, alongside of England's colonial growth, was to provide an undercurrent of controversy in many continental wars. A break in the Spanish succession in 1700, in the Polish succession in 1733, in the Austrian succession in 1740, each plunged the whole of Europe into war. Even the revolt from England of the United States in far-off America in 1776 found its echoes in Europe. As to the French Revolution of 1789, it convulsed the world.

In fact, while in one sense the imperial problem had narrowed down, in another it had widened out in every direction, and the Empire can no longer be looked at by itself alone. Previously Prussia and Austria, Austria and

France, France and England might go to war without other nations necessarily interfering in the contest. But the Thirty Years' War, with its multiplicity of issues, with most of the states of Europe ranged on either side, had altered all that. Now any war begun by any state against any other state, for any reason whatsoever, was liable to draw into the vortex several other states, who often took part for reasons quite different from the original reason of the war; or, if they had no private reason of their own, for general reasons connected with the "balance of power"—a growing factor in European politics. No nation could move now without affecting all the rest.

The result is, from this time, a series of wars in which most of Europe, directly or indirectly, was concerned, and in which, while the two rivals, Austria and France, were still opposed, Austria came to realise in time that her main enemy was not France but Prussia, France by and by transferred her hatred from Austria, her late opponent, to England, her old antagonist; Prussia was ultimately to find that not France or Austria but, once more, England stood chiefly in the way of her designs.

But the dominant note of the present period is French aggression. The immediate and main result of the Thirty Years' War was the emergence of France. Hapsburg Austria had been the prevailing terror of the Reformation era. The chief anxiety of the world now centred upon **Bourbon France**, against whom, first in the European ambitions of **Louis XIV**, then in the colonial schemes of **Louis XV**, lastly in the universal menace of the Napoleonic wars, all Europe more and more combined.

(c) *The House of Bourbon*

The separation of France and Germany at the Treaty of Verdun in 843, and the beginnings of French, as distinct from Frankish, history by the overthrow of the *Carlovingian* dynasty in 987, the emergence of France—her early great loss of territory—to Angevin England (1154–1204), her first bid for Italy in the seizure of Sicily and Naples (1266), and her high-handed treatment of the Papacy (1309)—under the *Capetian* monarchs (987–1327); the renewal of her struggle with England in the long Hundred Years' War (1338–1453), under the *Valois* kings (1328–1498)—leaving as legacy to the House of *Valois-Orléans* (1498–1589) the long Italian wars with the Empire (1494–1559)—have already been described. No sooner had the great Imperial duel of the Italian wars between the French King, Francis I, of this dynasty and the German Emperor, or Spanish King, Charles V.—a duel running side by side with the Reformation struggle in Germany—come to an end, than France also found herself distracted by the rival creeds of Roman Catholic and Protestant. From the resultant chaos a new line of kings—the Bourbon—was destined to emerge.

The **Huguenots**, or French Protestants (*Eidgenossen*, “confederates”)—followers, as we have mentioned, less of the German Luther than of the Swiss Calvin, originally their own countryman—had already appeared in France during the reign of Francis I. himself. But it was during the reigns of his successor, Henry II, husband of the Italian Catherine de Medici, and their three sons, Francis II., Charles IX., and Henry III., that they became prominent, and that the trouble reached its height; the Roman Catholic faction being championed chiefly by the House of *Gnase*, the Huguenot, by that of *Bourbon* or

Condé—of which the chief members were the Princes of Condé and **Henry Bourbon, King of Navarre**: the last now married to the daughter of Henry II.

Catherine herself, who lived through the reigns not only of her husband but of all three sons, fostered the ferment in order to keep the power in her own maternal and unscrupulous hands, favouring, or 'pretending to favour, now one side, now the other, though Roman Catholic at heart; and Philip II. of Spain, whose 'secret agents permeated all the counsels of France, inspired from a distance, with the same object, the same disturbing policy. The result was the cruel punishment of a conspiracy to place the Prince of Condé on the throne in the reign of Francis II.; the massacre of the Huguenots at the feast of St. Bartholomew by Charles IX.; the murder of the Roman Catholic leader, Henry of Guise, at the instigation of Henry III.; while the reigns of the two last monarchs were distracted by a series of seven religious wars

But the murder of Guise produced a general tumult of sorrow in Paris; its author was dethroned by the government of France, and in due course a Bull of Excommunication arrived from the Pope at Rome. Henry III., in despair, sent for his Protestant brother-in-law, Henry Bourbon of Navarre, whom he had disinherited; and the two kinsmen were preparing to march together on the rebellious capital when the King himself was suddenly struck down by the dagger of a monk. The dying Valois declared the Bourbon his successor. But Henry of Navarre had to fight for his crown; and a victory at Arques in 1589, an even more decisive success at Ivry in 1590 over his rivals, who were presently assisted from Flanders by the Spanish general, were not sufficient to

secure his acceptance in Roman Catholic France. At length in 1593, recognising the hopelessness of the position, he abjured the Protestant faith, was received in Paris and crowned next year, 1594, as **Henry IV.**—first of the Bourbon kings of France, and greatest, really, of them all.

Next year Henry expelled the Jesuits, chief enemies of his old religion, and declared war on the King of Spain, their chief supporter, and in 1598, feeling now free of foreign and domestic troubles, he issued the famous **Edict of Nantes**, granting a limited toleration to Protestants. His action did not, however, end the Huguenot trouble in France. Henry IV. himself was induced in 1603 to allow the Jesuits to be recalled. His successor, Louis XIII., acting by the hand of Richelieu, his great minister, besieged and captured *La Rochelle*, which had, as a matter of fact, become a stronghold of Huguenot intrigue, and afforded always a possible landing-place for English or other enemies. Louis XIV. in 1685 revoked the Edict of Nantes itself, and wholly suppressed the Huguenots in France. Their suppression was to mark a turning-point in the grand monarch's career. By the Huguenots, indirectly, the Bourbon dynasty had been ushered in; and by the Huguenots, indirectly, pause was to be given to Bourbon imperial designs.

(1) 1648–1715: LOUIS XIV. AND THE FIRST FRENCH MENACE

Meanwhile these Bourbon imperial designs had been developing apace.

Henry IV. (1589–1610), the first Bourbon king, while quieting for a time the religious difficulty at home, had also, by the colonisation of Canada, laid the foundation

of French colonial enterprise abroad. *Louis XIII* (1610-1643), his successor, had, under the guidance of Cardinal Richelieu, further settled the home difficulty by repressing the Huguenots and by attaching the nobles to the court; had glorified France internally, by the formation of the French Academy and a general support of art; and had left France, by his cunning policy in the Thirty Years' War, a counterpoise to hated Austria, the "Empire": in fact, had laid the foundation of a French power in Europe worthy of respect. It was reserved for *Louis XIV* (1643-1715), the little bewigged, high-heeled "Grand Monarch"—he was only 5 ft. 2 in—with his pomp and ceremony and etiquette, his airs, his graces, his court-leèves, his new elaborate Palace at Versailles—it was reserved for *Louis XIV*, building on these foundations, to aim at converting the Bourbon monarchy into a despotism in France—"L'État, c'est moi", and, while French power was still growing in Canada, to aim at converting France—now further embellished with her "Golden Age" of poetry—into a new Empire in the European world.

The reign of *Louis XIV*, the longest reign of any European monarch, lasting seventy-two years, falls—punctuated by his mistresses and his ministers—into three natural periods: (a) 1643-1661, the period of his minority—he was only five years old at his accession—when his mother, *Anne of Austria*, infanta of Spain, and Cardinal *Mazarin*—a nominee of the great Richelieu, and the lover, perhaps the husband, of the Queen—between them ruled the realm, (b) 1661-1683, the period of his success, when his mistress, the lively *Madame de Montespan*, governed the court, and *Colbert*, his able minister, directed the affairs of state, (c) 1683-1715, the period of his decline, when the ill-advised *Louvois* took over the helm of affairs,

and Louis, now under the duller and more decent governance of *Madame de Maintenon*, began to realise, with repeated failures, the pomp and vanities of the present world and prepare himself for another world to come. Of the first period, when Louis was still a minor, there is little to record here but a rising of some of the feudal nobles, "Les Frondeurs,"¹ in 1648—the year of the Peace of Westphalia, and the year before the execution of Charles I. by the people of England. It is with the second period, when Louis himself assumed the reins of government, that there began for Europe that ever-growing fear of French imperial ambitions, which, with each new disturbing move, created against itself a new and ever-growing coalition of European states.

Louis had succeeded to the throne five years before the final conclusion of the Thirty Years' War, from which, by the Treaty of Westphalia, France had, through the devices of Richelieu, emerged with the acquisition of *Alsace*. His earlier wars aimed at a continuance of this success (1) *War with Spain*, 1666–1668 In 1666 he opened a war with Spain, with the object of seizing the Hapsburg dependencies of Flanders and Franche Comté A "**Triple Alliance**" of Holland, England, and Spain forced him in 1668 to conclude the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. But, while by this treaty he was obliged for the time to give up his claim on Franche Comté, he retained a number of fortresses in the Low Countries. (2) *War with Holland*, 1672–1678 Meantime Louis had secured the neutrality of England and Sweden, and commenced a war of conquest

¹ A "Fronde" is a sling, a "Frondeur," a school-boy who slings stones. The term was applied in derision to the insurgent party, but was adopted by them with pride, and presently gave a name to a new fashion in dress. There were Fronde hats, gloves, fans, Fronde dishes, even Fronde songs.—Everything was "à la Fronde."

with Holland. A "Quadruple Alliance" was now formed between Holland, Prussia (Brandenburg), Austria, and Spain, but by the Treaty of Nimeguen in 1678 he acquired *Franche Comté*. To this possession he presently added by the seizure, 1678-1684, of *Strassburg*, *Luxemburg*, and other border strongholds: still failing, however, to annex Lorraine.

Louis was now at the height of his power. He had acquired from Hapsburg Spain her Burgundian provinces of Alsace, *Franche Comté*, and *Luxemburg* (parts of the old "Middle Kingdom" of Charlemagne), and was only waiting the opportunity for further conquest. But this was the turning-point in his career and, with the third period of his reign, decline began. In 1685 his impolitic Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, on the advice of Louvois, and the resultant suppression¹ of the Huguenots not merely lost to France and gave to other countries—England especially—a body of skilled workers in lace, metal, and other arts, but also alienated the Protestant states of Europe, and in 1686 the League of Augsburg for common defence against France was signed by Austria, Sweden, and Spain. to which the accession of William of Orange to the English throne in 1688 added two more important states, England and Holland, in the following year. This was the coalition which Louis had to face in (3) *the War for the Palatinate*, 1689-1697—a war chiefly famous for the crushing naval defeat administered by the English to the French at *La Hogue* in 1692; and, by the Peace of Ryswick in 1697, Louis had to acknowledge the Protestant succession in England and to restore to Spain and Austria many of his recent gains: though he still retained Alsace. (4) *The War of the Spanish Succession*, 1701-1714. One more

¹ The Huguenots were forbidden to emigrate, but many of them escaped by stealth

war—the first of three “Succession” Wars—closed Louis’ reign

In 1700 Charles II., the Hapsburg King of Spain, died childless ; and Hapsburg Austria and Bourbon France claimed, for family reasons, the right of supplying his successor. The direct junction of Spain to either Austria or France would have made either dangerously preponderant, and other European states would never have consented to so violent a subversion of the balance of power. Accordingly, the Hapsburg Emperor, Leopold I. of Austria, claimed the throne only for his second son ; Louis, the Bourbon King of France, only for his second grandson.

The Bourbon candidate, who had also been named as successor in Charles’s will, settled the question for the present by promptly making his way into Spanish territory and assuming the royal power as Philip V. of Spain. But the Austrian and imperial side of the House of Hapsburg objected to this settlement, the House of Hohenzollern, won over by the Emperor’s acknowledgment of the Elector of Brandenburg as King of Prussia, upheld the objection ; and other powers of Europe, for fear of the Bourbon Louis, supported the Hapsburg counter-claim. In the war which ensued, France, owing to the prompt action of Philip, was helped by Spain herself, but had to face a coalition greater even than before—the “Grand Alliance” of Austria, Prussia, England, Holland, Portugal, and Savoy. The war, which opened with campaigns in Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain, was marked by the capture of Gibraltar, 1704, on the one side, and a French menace to Vienna, the Austrian capital, on the other, but Marlborough’s victory at **Blenheim** in 1704—breaking the power of Louis by land, as that of La Hogue in 1692 had already broken it by sea—saved Austria ; his successes at Ramillies, Oudenarde,

and Malplaquet, following at intervals of two years, decided the defeat of France—mainly at the hands of England; and the Peace of Utrecht in 1713, though it left the Bourbon candidate on the Spanish throne, marked the humiliation of Louis on every side. Austria, dissatisfied with the loss of Spain, continued the war for another year, but, by the Peace of Radstadt in 1714, acceded to the previous peace with France: with Spain no peace was agreed to by the Emperor. In 1715 Louis died.

The Peace of Utrecht, like that of Westphalia, marks a phase not merely in the imperial rivalry of Austria and France, but in the history of Europe as a whole. The battle of La Hogue had crippled the power of France by sea, that of Blenheim by land, and the French terror was removed from Europe for a time—to be renewed a century later. Meantime, the power of the Hapsburgs had been further weakened by the loss of Spain, which is found henceforth upon the side of France; that of the Hohenzollerns further increased by the elevation of the Electorate of Brandenburg into the Kingdom of Prussia; while outside the Empire and its problems, and apart from her victories in Europe over France, Britain had been growing abroad, at the expense of Spain, Portugal, and Holland, in prestige and power.

The same Peace, incidentally, marks the emergence of the little Duchy of Savoy: an emergence destined later to have influence on Italian history. In 1713 Victor, Duke of Savoy, was rewarded for the part he had played in the late war, by the gift of the Kingdom of Sicily. He was obliged in 1720 to exchange Sicily for Sardinia. But it was from the House of Savoy-Piedmont that the first King of united Italy and Sicily, throwing off the yoke of the Hapsburgs and the Bourbons, was destined, in 1861, to come.

(2) 1715-1789: GROWTH OF PRUSSIA AT HOME.
OF ENGLAND ABROAD (LOUIS XV. OF FRANCE)

After the death of Louis XIV. France, foiled in her European projects, turned her attention once more to colonial enterprise. Beginnings of this, as has been mentioned, had already been made in Canada during the reign of Henry IV (1589-1610): now, after the comparative quiescence of Louis XIII. and Louis XIV., began under Louis XV. (1715-1774) the ambitious schemes of *Dupleix* in India. International wars still went on; the various states of Europe were still for varying reasons drawn into them, and in the course of them Austria declined still further. But the dominant note of the time was no longer the growing power of France, in spite of the addition of Spain to Bourbon influence; but the growing power of Prussia within the Empire, the growing power of Britain in her colonial expansion overseas, the growing power of the spirit of independence, which by and by was to declare itself still more emphatically, over all the world.

In all this, while the old hostility of France to Austria continued, the main rivalry now lay between Austria and Prussia at home, France and Britain abroad, until the earthquake of the French Revolution shook Europe at home and abroad alike, compelled Austria, Prussia, Britain to lay aside for a while their private differences, and united them with other European states to meet the renewal of the French terror in the Napoleonic Wars. When the turmoil of the Revolutionary period was past, the two powers, Prussia and Britain, which emerged successful from their respective rivalries, were to find themselves face to face, a great land Empire—the third

successor of the Roman Empire of the Caesars, and a great naval Empire, which meantime had been growing up beyond the sphere of Roman Empires in other continents.

There had already, at the end of Louis' reign, been a break in the Spanish line of Hapsburgs, before long there was to be a break also in the Austrian line. The Emperor, Charles VI. (1711-1740), was without male issue, and, to ensure the continued union of Austrian possessions under one Hapsburg sceptre, had issued the "**Pragmatic Sanction**," claiming that his eldest daughter, **Maria Theresa**, should be his successor on the Austrian throne. The first three wars of the period turn, directly or indirectly, on the attempts of other nations to disavow this claim. (5) *The War of the Polish Succession* (1733-1735), beginning nominally on a rivalry for the vacant throne of Poland, had for its real object the expulsion of the Austrians from Naples and Sicily, and the establishment of the Spanish Bourbons in their place. That object was attained by the Peace of Vienna, 1738, when the "Two Sicilies" became a secundo-geniture (second son's inheritance) of Spain, and *Lorraine* was made, at last, a French possession, though Francis Stephen, Duke of Lorraine, and future husband of Maria Theresa, received in compensation the Duchy of Tuscany, and the Pragmatic Sanction was guaranteed by France

(6) *The War of the Austrian Succession*, 1740-1748. In 1740 the Emperor, Charles VI., died, and, in spite of previous general agreement of the powers of Europe to the Pragmatic Sanction, there was a strong coalition, led by **Frederick the Great of Prussia**, to despoil Maria Theresa of her inheritance. England and, with England, Hanover, from which since 1714 now came the ruling dynasty of England, alone remained true to the young Queen;

against her were united France, Bavaria, Spain, Saxony, and Prussia. The main feature of the war was the unscrupulous seizure in 1740-1742 by the Prussian Frederick of the Austrian province of **Silesia**, a district on which he was able to confirm his hold in a "Second Silesian War," 1744-1745; and, by the **Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle** in 1748, Prussia was permitted to keep her ill-gotten gains; but Francis of Tuscany, now Maria Theresa's husband, was acknowledged as Emperor. At the same time the Protestant succession in England was recognised by the French King, and the Pretender was expelled from France.

The question of the Austrian succession was now settled, but not the question of Austrian territory. Frederick the Great was the life-long enemy of Maria Theresa; the seizure of Silesia marked the beginning of definite antagonism between Austria and Prussia; and (7) *The Seven Years' War*, 1756-1763, commenced with another attempt of the Empress to recover the province she had unjustly lost. But now, owing to the growing fear of Prussia and to other reasons, there was a re-shifting of the allies: Prussia and England, with whom Frederick had since come to terms, being pitted against a coalition of Austria, France, Russia, Saxony, and, ultimately, Spain.

At home the struggle resolved itself into a "Third Silesian War" between Prussia and Austria, in which, after a more than doubtful series of campaigns, Frederick was saved in 1762 by the sudden defection of Russia from the Austrian side; abroad, it developed into a grand colonial duel between Britain and France, in which Clive's victory at **Plassey** in 1757 acquired for England the control of India, Wolfe's success at **Quebec** in 1759 that of Canada, while Hawke's annihilation of the French fleet, also in 1759, at **Quiberon Bay** off Brittany, saved her from all fear, of

invasion, restored to her the mastery of the sea, and ensured connexion with her new dependencies. In 1763 the Peace of Hubertsburg between Prussia and Austria finally secured to Prussia the possession of Silesia; the Peace of Paris between England, France, and Spain gave to England Canada and Florida, but Cuba was ceded to Spain, and several of the Indian conquests were returned to France.

England was now at the zenith of her power, she had already, during the last period, in conflict with Spain, Portugal, and Holland (1558-1688), acquired the American Colonies; her recent struggle with France, during the present period (1688-1763), had given her Canada and India; the whole of North America, east of the Mississippi, was practically in her hands, and an important province in Asia was mainly under her control. Prussia had now thrown down the gauntlet to Austria, to the original Brandenburg she had long added Eastern Prussia (1618); her recent acquisition of Silesia had added a rich province to the south. Presently, on the iniquitous suggestion of Frederick, Poland was divided up between Russia, Austria, and Prussia: Russia obtaining the Eastern part, Austria getting Galicia, Prussia acquiring Western Prussia, and thus completing the continuity of Prussian territory along the north. This first **Partition of Poland**, occurring in 1772, was to be followed, after Frederick's death, by a Second Partition between Prussia and Russia in 1793, and this again by a Third between all three powers in 1795; the whole transaction being confirmed—though with considerable changes—by the Peace of Paris in 1815. Russia ultimately got about half, Prussia and Austria about a quarter each, and Poland, as a separate European state, disappeared from the map.

The years 1763 to 1774 were thus marked, within the Empire, not only by the further aggrandisement of Prussia under Frederick the Great, but also by a partial recovery of Austria under Maria Theresa: outside the Empire, by the sudden aggrandisement of England, and by further growth of Russia, now governed by Catherine II. But meantime the tide of freedom had been gathering force; and England, whose enormous successes in the Seven Years' War had created general jealousy, was the first to suffer—partly through her own success. In 1774 Louis XV. died.

(8) *The War of American Independence, 1775-1783.* In 1775, the year after Louis XVI's accession, the thirteen English colonies of North America, no longer needing the protection of the mother country, now that Canada had been wrested from French control, and resenting the unwise attitude of England towards them, especially in the imposition of the duty on tea, broke out in rebellion, and on July 4, 1776, issued a **Declaration of Independence**. In 1778 France supported the colonies in their action; in 1779 Spain allied herself to France; and in 1780 Russia, Sweden, and Denmark, resenting the British claim to search foreign vessels for contraband of war—a premonition of the events of later years—formed an "**Armed Neutrality**," which was presently joined by Prussia, Holland, France, and Spain. England found herself alone against all Europe; and, in spite of Rodney's defeat of the Spanish off *Cape St. Vincent* in 1780, and of the French at St Lucia in 1782, was obliged to sign in 1783 the **Treaty of Versailles**, by which she acknowledged the Independence of the "United States," and gave up certain conquests both to France and Spain.

But, meantime, matters had been developing in France.

French despotism had been becoming gradually intolerable at home, and the monarchy had for some time been living on a volcano of suppressed dissatisfaction and unrest. It had been a saying of Louis XV.'s favourite, Madame de Pompadour, "Après nous le déluge": and in the reign of his successor, Louis XVI. (1774-1789), the "deluge" came.—Partly inspired by the success of the United States abroad, partly incited by the oppression of the Bourbon dynasty at home, and the unpopular marriage of the Bourbon King, Louis XVI., with the Austrian Marie Antoinette, partly infected by the unrestful literature of philosophic thinkers, burst like a bomb (9) *the French Revolution of 1789*, followed by the terror of the Napoleonic Wars: and the States of Europe, forgetting their other contentions, combined for a second time for mutual defence against the common menace of France.

(3) 1789-1815: NAPOLEON AND THE SECOND FRENCH TERROR

The Revolution of 1789, as a movement for freedom, at first excited some sympathy in other countries, but it was soon obvious that they themselves were threatened, and in 1790 the Hapsburg Emperor issued an imperial manifesto—his last—inviting all civilised nations to combine against a common danger. Events moved rapidly. In April 1792 the Revolutionists compelled the King to declare war upon his brother-in-law, the Emperor, in September they deprived the King himself of his throne, and proclaimed a Republic under a "National Convention", in November they published their famous proclamation, urging the peoples of all other Kingdoms, in the name of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," to do the

like. The next year opened with the execution of Louis XVI.; continued with a declaration of war against England and Holland; ended with the execution of the King's Austrian consort, Marie Antoinette—in the middle of a "Reign of Terror," inspired by the villain Robespierre, and a mad orgy of massacre, which lasted from May 31, 1793, to July 27, 1794. The "National Convention" gave place in 1795 to a more sober "Directory" of five men; and this, in turn, in 1799 to a "Consulate" of three.

Meantime, the threat to Austria in 1792 produced an alliance between Austria and Prussia, but the Republican victories of *Valmy* and *Jemappes* swept the invaders from French territory and won for France the Austrian province of the southern Netherlands. The threat to England and Holland in 1793 produced the **First Coalition** against France (1793-1797), between Austria, Prussia, England, Holland, Spain, Portugal, and the Papal States. the French answer was a general *levée en masse* of the whole of France, which was promptly converted into one extensive camp. Holland was overrun; Spain presently joined her old friend, France, Prussia, more interested in her Polish schemes, retired from the contest. by 1796 Austria and England were left to carry on the war alone. It is at this point that the young Corsican, **Napoleon Bonaparte**, becomes prominent in the war. He had first appeared on the scene, as an artillery officer, at the reduction of the Royalist town of Toulon in the face of a British fleet; and the safe establishment of the Directory in 1795 was due mainly to his gunnery in the streets of Paris. He was presently to be one of the first three Consuls in 1799; sole Consul, for life, in 1802, Emperor in 1804.

It is beyond the scope of the present sketch to give a detailed account of Napoleon's career, but a brief outline of the Napoleonic wars is necessary to an understanding of the drift of Empire. The twenty years of terror, which the "Great Shadow" of his name inspired, falls roughly into three periods: (1) 1796-1807: the period of his rise, when his energies were directed chiefly against Austria; (2) 1807-1812. the period of his apparent height, but real decline, when England became his main objective, and the attempted enforcement of the "Continental System" against her caused one after another of the European powers to rise again on France; (3) 1812-1815: the period of his fall: when the failures of his enterprise in Russia and Spain enabled the successful coalition of his growing adversaries on every side. Six coalitions in all—counting the first, begun under the National Convention—were formed against him: Austria taking part in all but the fourth; Prussia, whose characteristic policy was to see Austria worn out by France, only, and for a long time doubtfully, in the first, the fourth, the last

(a) 1796-1807 *Success Reduction of Austria and Prussia*

In 1796 began the ten years' period of Napoleonic wars between France and Austria (1796-1806), which finally overthrew the unstable fabric of the Empire. Severe Austrian reverses, sustained chiefly on Italian soil, and checked but not prevented by British naval victories elsewhere, at the Nile in 1798, at Trafalgar in 1805, followed one another in unbroken succession—each series of disasters punctuated by a humiliating peace. The defeats

of Lodi, Arcola, and Rivoli, were summed up in the *Treaty of Campo Formio*, 1797, when the Cisalpine, Ligurian, and subsequently Helvetian Republics were established; those of Montebello, Marengo, and Hohenlinden in the *Treaty of Lunéville*, 1801, when the dismemberment of Italy under French influence was made complete. After that, Germany itself received attention, and the *dénouement* came rapidly and in successive years. In 1803 Napoleon reconstituted the whole Electorate of the Empire. In 1804 he was acclaimed Emperor of the French, and in the same year, 1804, Francis II., the Hapsburg Emperor, anticipated the evil day by assuming the sub-title of Emperor of Austria.

In 1805 came the final overthrow of Austria at Austerlitz, "the battle of the Three Emperors" (Austria was here allied to Russia), and the final treaty—*The Peace of Pressburg*. Already, earlier in 1805, Napoleon had made himself "King of Italy," with his stepson, Eugène Beauharnais, as "Viceroy." In July 1806 he bestowed the Hapsburg possessions in Italy on his brother Joseph, with the title of "King of Naples" (Sicily he could not reach, as the British controlled the sea); gave Holland to Louis Bonaparte, another brother, and united sixteen of the smaller states of Western Germany into the "Confederation of the Rhine," with himself as President. In August of the same year, 1806, Francis II., making a virtue of necessity, abdicated the old imperial crown, and still retaining, as Francis I., his old imperial title, became in name and fact, what he had long been in fact, and for the last two years in name—Emperor of Austria. The "Holy Roman Empire" was at an end.

Austria was crushed. But there still remained Prussia; and, in the distance, Russia. And now, after ten years' neutrality, Prussia, aggrieved by the formation of the

Rhine Confederacy and certain false dealing of Napoleon in a promised gift of Hanover, made alliance with Russia, and declared war on France. The double battle of Auerstädt and Jena in October 1806 settled the fate of Prussia, and Napoleon entered Berlin. In June 1807 Russia was defeated in the battle of Friedland, and in July of the same year the Czar and the Emperor met on a raft moored on the river Niemen. The result was the famous *Treaty of Tilsit*: concluded between France and Prussia, France and Russia separately. Northern, like Western Germany, was now reorganised; "Westphalia," a new-created kingdom, comprising Hanover, was given to a third brother, Jerome Bonaparte; and Prussia was limited in her standing army. Both Russia and Prussia now agreed to Napoleon's "Continental System," which will be presently explained. What passed between the Czar and Napoleon on the Niemen is not wholly known; but it looked as if the world was to be divided between them, provided that Britain could be quieted or overcome.

Napoleon's actual empire was more extensive at a later date, but the Treaty of Tilsit, in 1807, marks the real zenith of his power. Austria and Prussia had now both been subjected; Russia was his firm ally, and the whole of continental Europe was practically in his hands. Only Britain, within the charmed circle of her seas, still lay beyond his influence: and on Britain the whole attention of the conqueror was now to be concentrated.

(b) 1807-1812: *Height: Britain and the Continental System*

Again and again in history sea-power has proved a fatal check to land-ambition. It had been so with

Louis XIV.: it was to prove the same with Napoleon. Already the only serious set-backs to his victorious career had been from the British navy. Between his first and second Italian campaigns against Austria he had aimed a blow at the British Empire in India by an Egyptian expedition: his defeat by Nelson at the Nile in 1798 had almost cut him off from Europe. In 1803 he had assembled vessels at Boulogne for the invasion of England: Nelson's victory at Trafalgar in 1805 over the French and Spanish fleets had put such invasion out of the question. In 1806 the adjustment of his new Empire had been rendered incomplete, because the British navy had cut him off from Sicily. More and more he had realised that Britain was his stumbling-block: and now that the continent was his, he was free to concentrate on Britain. Three times he had isolated the island power: after the Peace of Campo Formio in 1797, after the Treaty of Lunéville in 1801, after the Peace of Pressburg in 1805.

And now the main object of the Treaty of Tilsit in 1807 was to attempt once more the isolating plan. Mere invasion had been proved hopeless: he must starve her out. In 1806, after Jena, he had issued from Berlin a proclamation known as the "Berlin Decree," embodying what he called the "Continental System," by which all nations on the continent were forbidden to trade with Britain. This decree was the most fatal mistake he ever made. Britain replied by blocking with her navy the ports of Europe; one nation after another rebelled against an arrangement which stifled their commercial life; and the wars, which, from 1807 onwards, ensued to force the system upon them, while they added from time to time fresh territory to his Empire, began immediately the course of his decline.

The first state to demur was *Portugal*—in 1807: the

answer was the invasion of the country by the French: England sent help, and the long **Peninsular War** (1808-1814) began. The next was *Spain*—in 1808 a similar invasion followed here: **Joseph**, Napoleon's brother, was made King of Spain, while Joseph's throne in Naples was given to Napoleon's brother-in-law, **Murat**. The next, in 1809, was *Austria*: who, though successful at **Essling**—one of the few engagements by land in which Napoleon failed—was crushed, for the fourth time, at **Wagram**. In the same year, on the refusal of the Pope to close his sea-ports to Britain, the *Papal States* were promptly confiscated; and, when the Pope replied with an excommunication, he was made captive, and ultimately conveyed to Fontainebleau.

Sweden, crippled in war by Russia, Napoleon's ally, over the possession of Finland, elected as her Crown Prince, in 1810, one of the French marshals, **Bernadotte**, founder of the present reigning House of Sweden—the only one of Napoleon's territorial arrangements which survived his fall. Bernadotte also declared, by and by, against the continental system, but so far he was on his master's side. In the same year, *Holland*, where Napoleon's own brother, **Louis**, had been made King, rebelled. Louis was promptly dethroned, and Holland was annexed once more to France.

Lastly, *Russia* herself was becoming restive: in December of the same year, the Czar issued a ukase against the system, and in 1811 began to prepare for war: but in 1811 Russia was still, in name, the ally of France.

In 1811, therefore, Napoleon's Empire was at its widest extent. Various new Republics—the Cisalpine, the Ligurian, the Helvetian, the Confederation of the Rhine—expressed one side of French influence in Europe; various new kingdoms—held mostly by Napoleon's family—another. One brother, Joseph, was King of Spain, a

second, Jerome, of Westphalia, a third, Louis (till recently) of Holland; his stepson, Eugène Beauharnais, was viceroy of Italy; his brother-in-law, Murat, was King of Naples; Bernadotte, his marshal, Crown Prince of Sweden. while Napoleon himself was King of Italy and Emperor of the world. That Empire, strong externally in the alliance with Russia, was, internally, wider, by the possession of Spain to the south and Sweden to the north, than the first Holy Roman Empire of the Franks; and it had been Napoleon's cue to take as his model Charlemagne, the Frankish Emperor himself.

At his coronation in 1804, he had summoned the Pope to Paris, and, in the Church of Notre Dame, had, like Charlemagne, lifted the crown from the altar, and placed it on his own head; in 1805 he had at Milan similarly assumed the iron crown of Lombardy; and in 1806 he had overthrown the old Empire in its Hapsburg form, to make room for the new Empire, thus created, in its place.—To complete the illusion and, at the same time, continue the succession, he had in 1810 divorced his first wife, Josephine, who was childless, and married the Archduchess Maria Louisa, of Hapsburg Austria: and now in 1811, when his summary seizure of the Pope resembled the high-handed methods of Otto the Great, and Philippe le Bel, a son was born to him, and proclaimed, at birth, "King of Rome." In this year it looked for a moment as if the Teuto-Roman Empire, first founded by the Frankish Charlemagne and the Saxon Otto, and reconstituted in its second form by the Austrian Hapsburgs, was to be replaced in a third form, wider even than the original, by the French Empire of Napoleon.

But the foundation of this third Empire was not for France; and the victories of Napoleon, especially those won over Austria, had only been clearing the way for the

advent of another power—Prussia. The wars waged to enforce the continental system against England, while they had increased his territorial sovereignty, had been creating also, on every side, a host of enemies, ready, on the first opportunity, to rise. Meantime England, against whom the whole absurd system had been directed, had not merely herself remained untouched, but had been growing in strength, from the first abroad, and lately too at home. Ceylon (1796), Trinidad (1797), Malta (1800), Guiana (1803), Cape Colony (1806), Mauritius (1810), had been passing from France, or from Spain and Holland, the enforced allies of France, into British hands; in the Peninsula (1808-1814), while Napoleon was busy elsewhere, Wellington had been victorious over Napoleon's generals at **Vimiera** (1808), **Albuera** (1811), and in other battles. And now Russia, long the ally of France, was at last to throw down the gauntlet—Within four years the unstable fabric of the great Empire had fallen in ruins.

(c) 1812-1815: *Fall*

(First stage. Moscow)—At the beginning of 1812, France, realising the Russian change of attitude, enforced concerted action from Prussia and Austria, Russia, in self-defence, concluded a treaty with Sweden and presently with England; and in June a huge host of French, Prussians, and Austrians, with Spaniards, Italians, and Germans from the Confederation of the Rhine, began its march into the heart of Russian territory. The disastrous retreat of the French and their subject-allies from **Moscow** in the winter of 1812-1813, when Napoleon himself fled home to Paris, leaving his army to make their way back as best they could; and the final success of Wellington in

the Peninsula at Vittoria in June 1813, when Joseph was forced to fly from Spain, mark the first stage in the story of Napoleon's fall. Russia and Spain, at the two extremes of the continent, were free from the invader. it only remained for central Europe to shake off the yoke.

(Second stage: Leipzig).—In March 1813, immediately after the French failure in Russia, and while the British were still winding up the war in the Peninsula, Prussia, ever ready to achieve independence, made alliance with Russia; and the German “**War of Liberation**” began. Napoleon, with an army of recruits, raised hurriedly to replace his Russian losses, twice defeated the two allies, but unwisely granted them a truce of several months; and, in August, Austria, emboldened by the news of Vittoria, joined Prussia and Russia. The addition of this third ally turned the scales. On October 16-18, 1813, Napoleon was defeated in a decisive battle at Leipzig, the “**Battle of the Nations**”; on March 31, 1814, the allies entered Paris, and in April of the same year Napoleon, renouncing for himself and his heirs the thrones of Italy and France, retired to the island of Elba. The Bourbon monarchy was restored in the person of Louis XVIII.,¹ brother of the Louis XVI whom the Revolution had dethroned and killed: and, in May, the new King concluded with the allies, on behalf of France, the First Peace of Paris.

(Third stage: Waterloo).—The powers of Europe then met to discuss a general settlement, and, in recognition of the part just played by Austria and of her previous dignity, Vienna was selected as the place of meeting. The work of the Congress was broken off in March 1815 by

¹ Louis XVII., son of Louis XVI, had died in 1795, without ever having reigned.

the sudden news that Napoleon had escaped from Elba and landed in the south of France at Cannes: and the "**Hundred Days**" (March 20 to June 29) began. The defeat of the ex-Emperor by the English and Prussians at **Waterloo**, June 18, 1815; his second abdication on June 22, when he idly proclaimed his son Emperor, as Napoleon II.; his flight and surrender to the British Admiral on the "**Bellerophon**"; his transportation to St. Helena, where he died in 1821, are too familiar to be repeated here.

The great shadow which had hung over Europe for twenty years was now finally dispersed, and the European conference, almost completed at Vienna, was now resumed at Paris. The net result of the three arrangements—the **First Peace of Paris** (May 1814), the **Congress of Vienna** (September 1814 to June 1815), and this, the **Second Peace of Paris** (November 20, 1815) was that *France* had to pay a heavy war indemnity, and submit to the withdrawal of her northern frontiers to their previous limits, but was allowed to keep *Alsace* and *Lorraine*, and the Bourbon Louis XVIII. was once more restored, *Prussia* received additional territory in Western Germany, *Austria* in Northern Italy, *Russia* in Eastern Poland, earlier possessions being roughly in each case confirmed; *England* retained *Malta*, *Heligoland*, and some of her other gains; *Holland* and *Belgium* were combined into the "**United Netherlands**"; the independence of *Switzerland* was finally recognised, and the Bourbon regime was restored in *Spain* in Ferdinand VII.; *Sweden*, in view of the part she had just played in the war, was allowed to retain *Norway* (recently ceded to her by the Treaty of Kiel in 1814), and received a new constitution—Bernadotte, Napoleon's old marshal, presently in 1818 becoming King and founder of the present Royal House of Sweden: this, as we mentioned

above, was the only one of Napoleon's territorial arrangements which survived his fall.

But, while other countries had thus become corporate polities once more, Germany was still disunited, and Germany was craving for unity—for unity and freedom. The Confederation of the Rhine had already been abolished, and various German States—thirty-nine in number—were now combined into a "**Germanic Confederation**" (1815–1866): but the Confederation had no head. Napoleon's humiliation of Austria had paved the way for Prussia, but Prussia, except at the last, had played a poor part in the recent struggle; Austria had still behind her the prestige of 400 years' imperial rule; and neither dared to move for fear of the other. The settlement of 1815 left Prussia and Austria face to face: and the question had still to be settled between them as to which should be the ruling power.

One French terror had been laid with the death of Louis XIV. in 1715; another had now vanished with the overthrow of Napoleon in 1815, and the direct fear of France was gone. But France was still to exercise indirect influence on the fortunes of the Empire in particular and the destinies of Europe as a whole especially it was her fate, time after time, to hold the ladder, by which Prussia mounted step by step, above the head of Austria, to the establishment of a third Empire, and ultimately, in 1914—just less than another century—to the creation of a third menace on European peace.

Above all, she had left a new antithesis. The French Revolution had raised a devil that could not be laid. Henceforth, Despotism and Democracy were face to face. From their mad struggle, even more than from the strife of rival states, the Third Teuton Empire was to emerge.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER VIII

1815-1914 · THIRD TEUTON ATTEMPT: PRUSSIA AND THE HOHENZOLLERNS (REVOLUTIONARY ERA)

The Hohenzollerns of Prussia. Policy of Metternich.

(1) 1815-1848 · *First stage, imperial crown offered to Prussia, 1849.*

(Problem due to decline of Austria and rise of Prussia)

Renaissance—Reformation—Revolution Forerunners, American Independence, 1776; French Revolution, 1789. France (in the middle of a new general "Industrial Revolution") now causes others

(a) 1820 Argentina, etc.; Greece and the Balkans (due to 1815)

(b) 1830 Belgium, etc. (due to Louis Philippe, "citizen-king").

(c) 1848. Austria, etc. (due to second French Republic)

Imperial crown offered to Frederick William of Prussia, but refused.

(2) 1848-1866. *Second stage, Prussia head of North Germany, 1866.*

Bismarck's Three Wars · 1 v Denmark, 1864 (Prussia gains Holstein)

2 v Austria, 1866 (Prussia forms North German Confederation)

(Successful revolt of Italy from Austria, 1861 Austria retires from Germany and forms Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy, 1867.)

(3) 1866-1871. *Third stage, Prussia head of German Empire, 1871.*

3. v France, 1870-1871. William I German Emperor, 1871.

(4) 1871-1888. *Stock-taking and reconstruction (William I)*

(a) The three great families: Hapsburgs, Bourbons, Hohenzollerns

(b) Problems of foreign policy Austria, Russia

(c) Colonial question.

(5) 1888-1914. *Growth and climax of aggression (William II.).*

(a) 1888-1904. Naval policy, Pan-German theory, Welt-politik.

(b) 1904-1914. Preliminaries of war. Science, "penetration," etc Tests 1905, Morocco, 1908, Bosnia; 1911, Agadir. Include Wars of Turkey v Italy, 1911, v. Balkans 1911-12.

(c) 1914 Outbreak of the Great War, powers on both sides

(d) Points at issue · 1 individual countries, 2 national groups, 3 political ideals

(e) Conclusion: Parallel of Sparta and Athens—with different end.

CHAPTER VIII

1815-1914 THIRD TEUTON ATTEMPT: PRUSSIA AND THE
HOHENZOLLERNS (REVOLUTIONARY ERA)

THE HOHENZOLLERNS OF PRUSSIA

As the name of Hapsburg is indissolubly connected with Austria, so the Hohenzollern family will always be associated with Prussia. But it was not in Prussia, but in Brandenburg that the greatness of the Hohenzollerns first began. Attention has been called before to the coincidence, by which the two families both rose to eminence in two frontier-states, and both first appeared in those states at the same epoch, the period of chaos, 1254-1437.

(a) *The Hohenzollerns become Electors of Brandenburg, 1415.*

In 926, Henry the Fowler, in order to hold the Wends in check, created a mark, or military frontier, along the Elbe; and in 963, his son, Otto the Great, for further security, divided this, the old mark, into three. To one of these three divisions, the *North Mark*, Albert the Bear was appointed as Margrave, or Governor, by the Emperor, Lothar of Saxony. Crossing the Elbe, Albert the Bear stormed the Wend fortress of *Brannebor*, and styled the

whole mark **Brandenburg**, with his new capture as capital, and himself Margrave of Brandenburg.

At some date unknown, but anyhow by the end of the thirteenth century, Brandenburg became an **Electorate**, and appears as such in the Golden Bull of 1356.

In 1415, the Emperor Sigismund, in recognition of certain services at his own election, conferred the Mark and Electorate of Brandenburg on **Frederick**, sixth Burgrave, or Borough-chief, of **Nuremburg** in Bavaria, a **Hohenzollern**, and on his male heirs in lineal descent.—Shortly afterwards, 1448, **Berlin**, originally a fishing village of the Wends called **Kolln**, became the **Hohenzollern** capital in Brandenburg.

(b) *The Hohenzollerns become Kings of Prussia, 1701.*

In 1226 the "**Teutonic Knights**," a religious order founded during the Third Crusade, had gone forth on a new "Crusade," and seized Prussia, a country inhabited by heathen Wends, the *Borussi*, so-called from their dwelling "next to Russia" (po Russia = Prussia). The Knights "converted" these heathen by practically exterminating them; and a number of other Germans gradually flocked into the conquered land. Troubles, however, ensued with the Poles, by whom the new German settlers were severely defeated in 1410; and, by the "Peace of Thorn," 1466, West Prussia was ceded entirely to Poland, **East Prussia** being still held—as a fief of Poland—by the Teutonic Knights.

In 1511 one **Albert of Hohenzollern** became grand-master of the Order, and in 1524 called himself "Duke" of *East Prussia*, under Polish suzeranty. He was a champion of the Protestant cause: and from this time dates the con-

nexion of the Hohenzollerns with Prussia and with Protestantism. There were now two branches of the Hohenzollern House, one in Brandenburg and one in Prussia, and it was agreed between them that, in the event of either branch becoming extinct, the other should inherit its estates. In 1618 the Prussian line failed, and **George, Elector of Brandenburg**, became also Duke of Prussia. The two provinces, geographically separate, were now united under one Hohenzollern rule.

It is to **Frederick William, the Great Elector** of Brandenburg (1640-1688), that the Hohenzollerns owe the beginning of their rise. He acquired part of *Pomerania* by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648; freed *East Prussia* from Poland in 1656 (West Prussia in the middle still remaining Polish), and reduced his straggling dominions into a well-ordered state. Such was the condition of affairs, when—as a bribe for assistance in the coming struggle with France over the Spanish succession—**Frederick** (1688-1713), son of the Great Elector, was allowed by the Emperor Leopold I. to take the title of “**King of Prussia**,” as **Frederick I.**, crowning himself in 1701 with great splendour at *Königsberg*, the capital of East Prussia: which has since then remained the coronation place of Prussian Kings.

(c) *The Hohenzollerns become German Emperors, 1871*

The subsequent rise of the Hohenzollern family has partly been touched upon already; and falls partly into the narrative of later things. But the gap between the two parts may conveniently be filled in here.

Frederick William I. (1713-1739), son and successor of the last monarch, has been called the “Second Founder of Prussia.” He was certainly eccentric, and, perhaps, half-mad.

But there was a method in his madness. With his giant *Potsdam Guards*, his well-drilled army of 80,000 men, his iron, if cramping rule, he initiated the military machine which was afterwards to achieve such startling results, and he left to his son an instrument ready for immediate use. But it is to that son, **Frederick II., the Great** (1740-1786), a genius as general, a skilful diplomatist, and a man quite devoid of any principle, that the future greatness of Prussia is—after the great Elector—mainly due.

He succeeded to the throne just at the time of the break in the Hapsburg succession to the throne of Austria. Prussia, along with other powers in Europe, had subscribed to the "Pragmatic Sanction," passed nearly thirty years before, to secure the accession of Maria Theresa to her father's throne. But Frederick, regardless of previous promises, promptly took advantage of the confusion of a changing rule, to wrest from Austria in 1741 the rich province of *Silesia*; and through the thick and thin of all the wars which followed—known in Germany as the "Silesian Wars," elsewhere as the "War of the Austrian Succession"—retained his grip on the new district: which was finally ceded to him at the Peace of Paris in 1763. From this seizure of *Silesia* dates the beginning of the hatred of Austria for Prussia.

It was he who, with equal immorality, pursuing the old feud of the Teutonic Knights with the Poles, suggested to Austria and Russia in 1772 the First Partition of **Poland**, from which he himself acquired *Posen* and *West Prussia*, thus uniting for the first time East and West together. though the transaction was only completed after his death, in later "deals" between the three powers in 1793 and 1795, all summed up, with certain changes, in the Peace of Paris, 1815, and ending with the practical erasure of Poland from the map of Europe

The last years of his life he spent in organising his ill-gotten gains. In these last years, too, he formed the "*League of Princes*," to oppose the ambitious designs of the Emperor Leopold II., the Austrian : a league memorable, as recognising the headship of Prussia among the Northern states, as anticipating the later North German confederation ; and as formulating, up to date, the rivalry between Prussia and Austria in the claim of each to be the leading state. And under him, too, Berlin became a centre of light and learning in Northern Germany. He died in 1786 : leaving behind him a well-ordered kingdom which stretched now in one unbroken tract from Brandenburg to East Prussia, with additions further south ; an efficient army just double the size of that—already great—which he had inherited ; and a model of unscrupulous militarism, which was to be reverently and religiously imitated by Prussian monarchs and ministers in after years.

Such was the height of greatness to which Prussia had reached, when there burst on Europe the chaos of the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, and subsequent disturbances : out of which, by successive stages, Prussia was to emerge first definite head of Northern Germany, and then in 1871 head of a new German Empire.

Meanwhile, to the selfish policy of Austria, and especially of one man, much, if not of the chaos in Europe, at any rate of the difficulty which Europe now had in emerging from that chaos, was primarily due Austria had ceased to be head of the Empire in 1806 : her subsequent desire was to recover that position—or if she could not do that, to prevent any other European power from doing so.

In 1809, three years after the end of the "Holy Roman Empire," Metternich became Austrian Minister. It was

chiefly through his diplomacy that in 1810 the marriage of the Austrian Archduchess Maria Louisa to the Emperor Napoleon had been arranged; through him that Russia and Prussia became suppliants in 1813 for Austrian help, through him, in 1815, that Austria was dominant in the councils of the Allies in the Treaty of Vienna and the Peace of Paris. Napoleon had now fallen, and the re-entry of Austria to imperial power had now been closed. And now, for the next thirty years, the policy of Metternich was to dominate Europe; and that policy was directed to preventing any coalition of power on the continent. Especially, he aimed at checking the aggrandisement of Russia and Prussia, at opposing any recognition of national unity in Germany and Italy. This, the disintegration of other states to the advantage of Austria, has been the policy of Austria through all time.

It was only on the overthrow of Metternich himself in 1849 that Europe was able to emerge—to find herself face to face with the emergence also of a new Prussian power, which was to end in the formation of the Third Teuton Empire under Prussian auspices.

(1) 1815-1848 : FIRST STAGE: OFFER OF IMPERIAL CROWN TO PRUSSIA (1849)

The Renaissance in Italy had given intellectual freedom; the Reformation in Germany had secured religious freedom; the Revolution in France had sounded the trumpet of political freedom; and the same note was to peal again and again over Europe in the succeeding years—sounded always, in the first instance, from the same land of France.

As the Reformation of Luther in 1519 had been anticipated by the reform movement of Wycliffe and Huss

about 1380, so the French Revolution of 1789 had had its forerunners in earlier years: religious Reformation and political Revolution sometimes coinciding; and disturbing movements, in the one as in the other, had passed over Europe in successive waves. About the time of Wycliffe had occurred the Peasants' Revolt, La Jacquerie, in France, 1358; Wat Tyler's Rebellion in England, 1381; the initial revolt of Switzerland from Hapsburg rule, 1393. The year 1648, which closed the Reformation period, marked also in Germany the independence of local princes; in France, the outbreak of the Civil War of La Fronde; in England, the practical conclusion of the Civil War, with the execution of the Stuart King in the succeeding year. Lastly, in 1776 had come the Declaration of Independence of the United States, just preceding, and half heralding, the great French Revolution of 1789.

Meantime, beneath these political revolutions, a revolution of a different kind, but tending to the same issue and affecting all future wars, treaties, revolutions themselves, had been going on; a revolution originating mainly in Britain and America, closely challenged in France, triumphantly elaborated later by German thoroughness, a revolution scientific, economic, social—summed up in the term **Industrial Revolution**. First came the introduction of *Machinery*. From the middle of the eighteenth century, science, specially busy now in all directions, had been mastering the treatment of metals, particularly of steel and iron; and this mastery was turned to new account, when, circ. 1765, the use of steam as a driving power for engines was discovered by Watt. The result was the substitution of mechanical for human agency, big farms for small; the factory system; the flocking of population from the country to the town. But the working of machinery required

skill; and urban life was a more quickening thing than rural life. Hence an increase of knowledge in the labouring class; and the attention now paid to education, especially by and by in Germany, showed the recognition of the need for even more

Followed new facilities for *communication* in the further application of steam as a motive power. Steamboats were tried on the Thames and Clyde circ. 1800; the first locomotive was assayed on land circ. 1805: in 1830, Stephenson's "Rocket" ran on rails between Manchester and Liverpool—in the heart of the industrial area. Before long there were railroads all over Europe. Countries were now opened up also with canals and trams. In 1835 the transference of news was accelerated by the invention of the electric telegraph: though it was not till later, circ. 1880, that electricity was satisfactorily harnessed for traction or for light. All this, with freer Post and Press, enlivened business, trade, commerce. It disseminated also more knowledge—and more unrest—among the general mass.

Most of all, in the process of all this change, the old antithesis of *Capital and Labour*—as in the early days of the Roman Republic and again in the period of the Roman Civil Wars—was becoming strongly emphasised. Hitherto, Capital, already organised, had long held over Labour a cruel upper hand, and the recent changes were at first leading further, at the expense of Labour, to the profit, in finance, of Capital. To show how far the evil had advanced in Britain, the First Factory Act, passed in 1833, had to prohibit the employment of children of nine in factories, and to limit the work of employees to 12 hours a day; and the conditions of Labour, in spite of this and other philanthropic measures, continued to be intolerable.

But Labour had also been gaining in knowledge during

the change, was gradually becoming conscious of its own power; was learning more and more, by organisation, to protect itself. Trade Unions, formed at first secretly and for other objects professedly, were in 1824 partly recognised by the British Government; with each successive political crisis, Labour in several countries was able by the threat of strikes to acquire ever better terms; theories of Co-operation, Socialism, Communism were everywhere gradually gaining ground; "Freedom" and "Democracy" were more and more surely asserting themselves:—until at length Demos, exasperated by the oppression of centuries, now further goaded by unscrupulous agitators and the power of the Press, was finally to burst its bonds, to emerge, a beast uncontrolled, into mastery, and, paralysing the life of the community with its blind strength, to prove, by the establishment of a despotism more tyrannical than that of any real despot, "the falsehood of extremes."

The more subdued phase of this Industrial Revolution extended in most countries roughly over the century lasting from 1750 to 1850: with them its more violent climax was to follow under the current of political upheavals yet to come. It was in the middle of the first and more peaceful phase that France had anticipated the mad *dénouement* by the sudden outburst of her Political Revolution in 1789.—And now, when the main disturbance of the Revolutionary era (1789-1815) had subsided, there shivered across the world a succession of tremors after-movements of the main Revolution, and, as has been mentioned, emanating, directly or indirectly, from France itself.

(a) 1815.—In September 1815 the Czar, who considered the successful issue of the war to be mainly due to himself, and now regarded himself as protective patron of the peace of Europe, concluded the "Holy Alliance" between Russia,

Prussia, and Austria, to preserve monarchical rule, and suppress any recurrence of liberal revolt. But the spirit of Revolution was still in the air; and outbreaks soon occurred in **Italy, Spain, and Portugal**. These movements were more or less successfully dealt with: Italy being promptly crushed by Austria, and France herself suppressing Spain. But when revolt spread to the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in South America, the action of the Alliance was met by the famous Doctrine of Monroe, President of the U.S.A. (1817-1825), which stated that any European interference in **America**, north or south, would be considered an unfriendly act; and between 1817 and 1822, *Colombia, Peru, Chili, Mexico, Brazil* achieved independence. Similarly, in the **Balkans**, now came the first uprising of Slavs and Christians against Mahommedan domination; the Turks were defeated in the sea battle of Navarino in 1827 by the English, French, and Russians—Russia acting partly as patron of the Slavs, partly as rival of Turkey; and in 1829 **Greece** was declared free of Turkish rule.

(b) 1830—These movements were hardly over, when the "*July Revolution*" began in Paris; the Bourbon monarchy, now held by Charles X., was once more abolished in France; and Louis Philippe, Duke of Orléans, the "citizen-king," received the crown. Promptly, **Belgium**, which had always chafed at the establishment of the United Netherlands, declared herself independent of Holland, and her independence was guaranteed next year, 1831, by Britain, France, Russia, Austria, and Prussia.¹ In **Germany**, some of the Northern states—Hanover, Brunswick, Saxony—claimed, and secured, from their rulers

¹ This was confirmed by the Neutralisation Treaty signed in London 1839—the "*scrap of paper*" which the Germans tore up when they invaded the country on August 4, 1914.

constitutional privileges. But the revolt of Italy in 1830 (it was now that the "Young Italy" party was formed by the patriot Mazzini) succumbed, like that in 1820, to Austrian energy; and Poland, attempting similar rebellion, was reduced to a Russian province. In Britain, the "*First Reform Bill*" was passed in 1832. Spain, 1833-40, was in the throes of "Carlist" trouble—the claims of Don Carlos, on the death of his brother Ferdinand VII. without a son.

Then (c) in February 1848, came, like a thunderclap, the news of the overthrow of Louis Philippe himself, and of the proclamation of a Second Republic in France—with Louis Napoleon, nephew of Napoleon I, as President. In Prussia, riots followed in Berlin and elsewhere, demanding freedom of the press, trial by jury, and religious toleration, and Prince William, the king's brother, fled to England. In the Austrian Empire, the Slavs of Bohemia, the Magyars of Hungary, the Latins of Italy, broke out in rebellion; and Metternich, the Austrian minister, to whose sinister policy the disintegration of the powers had been largely due, likewise sought in England an exile's home. In Denmark, the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein rose in revolt, tried to throw off the Danish yoke, and appealed to Prussia for assistance.

Meantime, a Parliament of united Germany had hurriedly assembled at Frankfurt in May 1848, to meet the requirements of the new situation, and give effect to the aspirations of German freedom and German unity. The question of the position of Austria in a united Germany at once arose. Two alternatives presented themselves, (1) Were only the German provinces of Austria to be included? Austria naturally objected to this as dividing her Empire under two authorities. (2) Was Austria to be incorporated as a whole? The rest of Germany demurred to this as

including non-Germanic elements. One other alternative remained—the only solution really possible—(3) the exclusion of Austria as a whole. But the shadow of the Holy Roman Empire, so long associated with Austrian Hapsburgs, still hung over the assembled delegates, no conclusion was reached at the time or afterwards, and in December 1848, Ferdinand I., the reigning Emperor, who by his weakness, rather than his inclination, had become committed to the revolutionaries, abdicated—his nephew, **Francis Joseph** (1848-1916), ascending the Austrian throne.

The eyes of Germany now turned in despair to Prussia; and in April 1849, the imperial crown was offered to the Prussian King, Frederick William IV, who had professed some sympathy with the new movement. But neither the hour nor the man had yet arrived. Frederick William feared to accept an offer which Austria had not endorsed, and the various states gradually dropped back into their old condition. Denmark retained Schleswig and Holstein, Prussia once more acknowledged the vague supremacy of Austria; and Austria recovered her hold on Italy, Bohemia, and Hungary: the last, largely by the help of Russia. By 1851, the convulsion of 1848 was apparently as if it had never been: and in the next year, 1852, France herself, the origin of all the trouble, supplied one more surprise. Louis Napoleon, her new President, established by a "coup d'état" a second French Empire as Napoleon III.¹

But the events of 1848 had marked a first stage in the emergence of Prussia. Austria was receding more and more from the Confederation of German States, Prussia was more and more becoming its acknowledged head, and it

¹ "Napoleon II" (1811-1832) was son of Napoleon I. by Maria Louisa (pp 201, 204).

was clear that the rivalry of the two powers was approaching a point where the decision between them could be settled only by the arbitrament of war.

(2) 1848-1866 : **SECOND STAGE : PRUSSIA, HEAD OF
NORTHERN GERMANY, 1866**

Meantime, while Germany was labouring with the travail-pangs of Empire in Europe, the Empire of *Great Britain*, her destined rival, had been quietly maturing and growing overseas. In Europe, not merely was she complete in her own triple realm, but she possessed outposts commanding almost every land : Heligoland to the west of Germany, the Channel Islands off the coast of France, Malta to the south of Italy, Gibraltar on a promontory in Spain itself. And now to her already vast possessions in America, Asia, and Africa, she had been adding extension of her old colonies in the East, and the development of new colonies in Australia and New Zealand (1815-1848).

Russia, too, big with the importance of the Napoleonic Wars, had now begun her disquieting activities towards the East. She had long been desiring to treat Turkey, "the sick man of Europe," to the same system of partition to which she had already treated Poland ; and now in 1853, Russian forces occupied the Turkish States of Moldavia and Wallachia, the modern Roumania. Britain and France demurred ; French and English fleets entered the Dardanelles ; and the **Crimean War**, 1854-1856, was the result. The war gained its main object, the evacuation by Russia of the threatened provinces ; but its unwise continuance on the south coast of Russia involved great losses to the allies — a set-back, followed, in the case of England, by the **Indian Mutiny** of 1857, in the succeeding year.

Lastly, *Italy* now made her fourth bid for freedom, and at length achieved success. In 1858 there was an "accidental" meeting between the Sardinian minister Cavour and the French Emperor Napoleon III.; and in the ensuing year, 1859, the Savoyard kingdom of Piedmont and Sardinia, supported by France, by Italian troops under the patriot Garibaldi, and by the sympathy of Prussia, declared war on Austria. The victories of the allies at Montebello, Magenta, and Solferino, followed by the Peace of Villafranca—all in 1859—freed Lombardy, part of the Lombardo-Venetian provinces of Austria in northern Italy, from the Austrian Hapsburgs; next year, 1860, Garibaldi, turning his attention to the south, succeeded in freeing Sicily and Naples from the Spanish Bourbons; and in 1861, Italy and Sicily, freed at last from both Austrian and Spanish influence, became, with the exception of Venetia and the Papal States,¹ one united kingdom under a monarch of her own choice, Victor Emmanuel, King of Sardinia—Savoy itself, with Nice, having been surrendered in the previous year to France while Savoyard Piedmont in north Italy formed part of the new Italian realm.

It was just at this point, when Austria had thus lost half her Italian provinces, that the second stage of the emergence of Prussia began, bringing with it the final humiliation of her Austrian enemy. In 1861, the year of the Liberation of Italy, William I., a monarch of the old Prussian

¹ Venetia was ceded first to France, then to Italy by Austria after the battle of Sadowa in 1866, the Papal States were assumed by the King of Italy perforce in 1870, and Rome then became the capital of an Italian kingdom, now almost (v. *inf.* p. 244) complete. On the indignant retirement of the Pope to the Vatican after this last event, see *sup.* p. 113.

At this same date, in far America, was confirmed the union of the United States, now 34 in all. In 1861, the 11 Slave States to the South claimed the right to secede from the rest. The Federal (N) and Confederate (S) War, 1861-5, ended in the triumph, under Pres. Lincoln, of the North.

type, became King of Prussia; in 1862, **Otto von Bismarck**, a man of still stronger feudal views, who had represented Prussia in the Federal Diet from 1851 to 1859, was made his minister; and in 1863 Austria attempted to restore her dwindling prestige by summoning a congress to discuss reforms. Prussia, alone of the states, declined — by Bismarck's advice — to attend the conference. The gauntlet was now thrown down to Austria, and **three aggressive wars**, following one another in rapid succession, all three engineered by Bismarck, gave Prussia two important provinces, overthrew the power of Austria, and made the Prussian king Emperor of the whole of Germany.

(a) **War against Denmark, 1864**. — The King of Denmark died in 1863, and the Duchies of *Schleswig* and *Holstein*, which had already, with Prussian support, tried to throw off the Danish yoke, once more asserted their claim to independence. Prussia once more supported the claim; Austria opposed it, but was overruled; and in 1864 the two powers, for the time nominally allied, easily defeated the Danes, overran the two Duchies, and assumed the joint sovereignty of both: Prussia taking the provisional administration of Schleswig, Austria that of Holstein. The settlement was, however, displeasing to the smaller states; the position of Austria, victor in a war she had never wanted, was false and anomalous; and, behind all, lay the rivalry of the two chief actors, the one with a great past behind her, the other with her future all before — a rivalry which, as Bismarck said, could be settled only with "blood and iron."

(b) **War against Austria, 1866**. — War broke out in 1866, and all Germany was ranged on one side or the other: the Northern states, with Italy, on the side of Prussia, the Southern states on that of Austria. An easy victory

was expected for the Austrian side, but the war was over in seven weeks in favour of Prussia. At the battle of *Sadowa*, or *Koniggratz*, in Bohemia, 1866, Prussia, with her new breech-loading, or "needle" guns, defeated the Austrian league, and by the **Peace of Prague** which followed, Prussia received Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover,¹ the two Hesses, and Nassau; Austria ceased finally to form part of Germany, and the German Confederation was at an end. Its place was taken by a **North German Confederation**, with Prussia at its head: the Southern States were to remain neutral, but to ally themselves with Prussia in case of war. Next year, 1867, Austria completed her separation by forming, with her Hungarian dependency, the "**Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary**"—the two realms being autonomous but united under the Hapsburg emperor. As to Italy, in spite of certain defeats on sea by Austria, she now received Venice, which she had failed to win in 1861; and the recognition of Rome as capital in 1870 gave completeness to the new Italian monarchy.

Prussia was now head of half Germany—the North: the third stage—introduced by the third war—was to see North and South combined, with Prussia as the head of both.

(3) 1866-1871: **THIRD STAGE: THE NEW PRUSSO-GERMAN EMPIRE, 1871**

(c) **War against France, 1870-71**—Once more France was unwittingly to lend a hand in the building of Prussia. In 1867, *Napoléon* III, who had established a doubtful second Empire in France (1852), proposed to purchase from Holland the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg. Prussia

resented the transaction; the Great Powers intervened, and it was now that the neutrality of Luxemburg was guaranteed. The "*Luxemburg Question*" was thus tided over. But the French, for the old sentimental reasons, still hankered after the provinces on the west of the Rhine, the Emperor, uncertain of his own crown, was anxious to distract the thoughts of the French from home affairs; people and monarch alike regarded what professed to be a striving after German unity as mere Prussian aggression. In 1870, the election of a Hohenzollern Prince to the *throne of Spain* seemed to confirm this last belief, and objection was promptly made to King William by the French ambassador at Ems. The Prince meanwhile voluntarily resigned his claim, but the French ministry now further requested assurance that such candidacy should never be renewed. This request was refused by the King; the circumstances of his refusal were made, by the juggling of Bismarck, to appear as an insult to the Court of France; and in July 1870 the French Emperor, glad of an excuse to divert attention from his own questionable tenure of the throne, declared war on Prussia.

In so doing he believed in the military efficiency of France; he counted on the active support of Austria; he expected the secession from Germany of the Southern states. He was disappointed in all three regards. The French Army proved (as it was to prove later) to be ill-prepared, Austria stood aloof from the contest; and the Southern states threw in their lot with Prussia. The defeat of France at *Sedan*, the abdication of the French Emperor, the capitulation of Metz, all fell in September and October of 1870. Paris, after a siege of four months, surrendered on January 28, 1871; and by the *Peace of Frankfurt*, which ensued, France paid to Prussia a heavy war indemnity, and

ceded to her the Rhine districts of **Alsace** and **Lorraine**. A Third Republic followed the issue of the war in France

On January 18, 1871, while the Prussian army was still before Paris, the title and office of "**German Emperor**" was conferred on the **Prussian King, William I.**, in the palace of Louis XIV. at Versailles; and North and South Germany were finally united in one under Prussian auspices. The union, if not the freedom, of Germany was at length attained; and a third Teuton Empire was established, in succession to the old Empire of the Romans, with the family of Hohenzollern at its head.

(4) 1871-1888: **STOCK-TAKING AND RECONSTRUCTION (WILLIAM I)**

(a) *The three great families*

Three great families, all sprung from parts of the Frankish empire of Charlemagne, have troubled the peace of Europe, beside imperilling their own, with the fatal dream of reviving once more the Carlovingian empire, in its reproduction of the old Roman Empire of the West. The first revival, the so-called "**Holy Roman Empire**" (962-1254), founded by the Saxon Otto, had been concerned with the rivalries of German dukes at home, or the struggle of Pope and Emperor abroad; had left the rest of Europe comparatively unaffected. and had brought disaster only on Germany and Italy themselves; a disaster growing in significance during the subsequent two hundred years (1254-1437). It is after this, with the materialisation of the second, or **Austrian, Empire** (1437-1648), and the attempts first of France, then of Prussia, to overthrow it and establish a third empire in its place (1648-1871), at a time when it was becoming more and more impossible for any state in Europe to move without affecting, directly or

indirectly, every other state—that European peace, already threatened by the Turkish peril from the East, and presently menaced by the growing aggression of Russia along the north, was disturbed also by the imperial contentions in the west, and the rival ambitions of these three great families.

The **Hapsburgs of Austria** themselves had caused the first anxiety. Sprung from Hapsburg in Switzerland, where they were Stewards of the Forest States; *Dukes* (1276) and then *Archdukes* (1453) of the frontier state of Austria, to which, by marriage rather than conquest, they added fresh territory year by year—even Spain at one time (1519-1700) being included in their family possessions; finally *Emperors* of the second empire from 1437 to 1648 (nominally till even 1806) they had, in the last period of their power (1519 to 1648), threatened Europe with the menace of an even wider sway, and much of European history, both before and after that date, is concerned with the efforts of various states—Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Bohemia, Hungary, Spain itself, and Italy—to free themselves from the Austrian, Spanish, or imperial pretensions of the Hapsburg family.

The **Bourbons of France** had been the next: a trouble beginning in pre-Bourbon times with the first establishment of Hapsburg power, the long Italian wars (1494-1559) of France against Spain or Austria, and the great rivalry for Empire between the *Valois Francis I.* and the Hapsburg Charles V; culminating under the *Bourbon monarch Louis XIV* (1648-1715), when the check to Hapsburg ambition in the Thirty Years' War afforded an opening for French imperial hopes and the League of Augsburg had to protect Europe from the fear of France, ending with the inheritance of Bourbon hate in the French Revolution and

the *Napoleonic Wars* (1786-1815), when all Europe had to combine to meet an even greater menace from the French, when the second, or Hapsburg Empire, was actually overthrown, and when it looked for a while as if a third empire was to come into being—this time from the side of the “Western Franks”—*i.e.* from France

And now, after the French interlude, the Hohenzollerns of Prussia, finding, like the French, their first opportunity after 1648, reaping what the French had sown, and taking, on the French assault on Austria, had succeeded where the French had failed. The Hohenzollerns had sprung from Nuremburg in Bavaria, and, like the Hapsburgs, had first come into prominence as masters of a frontier state. *Electors of Brandenburg* in 1415, *Kings of Prussia* in 1701, lords of a domain ever growing by unscrupulous aggression to the North and West, as had that of Austria, by matrimonial alliance, to the South and East: they had now emerged from the chaos of the Revolutionary era as monarchs of the whole of Northern Germany in 1866 and creators of the *Third German Empire* in 1871—a new empire which was to imperil, as it had never before been imperilled, European peace.

Napoleon once said that the great mistake of his life lay in not exterminating the family of Hohenzollern. The world was to have good reason to endorse his view.

(b) *Problems of Foreign Policy. Russia, Austria*

The new Empire^f began quietly, busy for the first ten years in taking stock, and meanwhile, for a time, the gaze of Europe became centred on the East

Russia had already been checked in her designs on Turkey by the Crimean War. In 1875 came another rising

of the Balkan States, supported by Russia, against Turkish control, and, by the "*Berlin Conference*" of 1878, which further settled the freedom and frontiers of the various states, Russia gained Bessarabia. But the anxieties of the European powers disappointed her fuller hopes of gains in the Balkans, especially of free access to the open sea; and the "Colossus of the North" now sought expansion in central Asia, where her growing aggression began to threaten, through Afghanistan, the *British Empire of India*: later, with the formation of the *Trans-Siberian Railway*, her designs extended even further East. The relation of Russia to the Balkans is known as the "**Eastern Question**"; her approach on China as the "**Far Eastern Question**." But the nearer East was the more important to European politics; and here the question was presently complicated by the appearance of a rival, Austria: whose ambitions, shut off from the West by the events of 1866, now began to take an Eastward trend, threatening the Balkan States. And, by and by, Germany followed—perhaps even now intended to follow—when Austria could clear the way.

It was about 1880, shortly after the Berlin Conference, that Germany began to awake to her relations with the outer world. And now the Eastern designs of Austria presented a new problem to German foreign policy. Bismarck had created, in 1872, the "*Three Emperors' Alliance*," between Prussia, Austria, and Russia. But the Balkan question now rendered necessary a choice between Russia and Austria; and, in 1879, Bismarck, unwillingly, formed an Austro-Prussian alliance: followed, in 1882, by the "**Triple Alliance**" between *Prussia, Austria, and Italy*—the last, owing to differences with France on the question of Morocco. At the same time, he did not wish altogether "to cut the wire to St Petersburg", and a few years later,

he concluded, behind the back of Austria, a “**Re-insurance Compact**” with Russia. Austria had every reason to hate Prussia; Italy had every reason to hate Austria; and it is a tribute to Bismarck’s diplomacy that he could make, and maintain, an understanding between three powers so opposed. It is still more a tribute to his skill, if not to his morality, that, while retaining the friendship of Austria, he did not wholly lose the good will of Russia.

(c) *Beginnings of the Colonial Question*

An even bigger problem was the *Colonial* question. Art, science, manufacture had developed by leaps and bounds; German trade spread widely over other lands, and Germany was beginning to hanker after foreign colonies. About 1880 commenced the European “grab” for Africa. Germany took part in the rush, planting colonies on the African coast, also in the Pacific islands; and about this time the “*Colonial Society*” was formed in Germany. To the colonial expansion, as to the Austrian policy, Bismarck, fearing international complications, and knowing perhaps the limitations of his own countrymen, was only slowly and unwillingly converted. His design was to make Prussia pre-eminent in Germany, Germany in Europe; to safeguard relations with other European powers, especially against the Anglo-Saxon power of Great Britain, and to this end he capped his diplomatic deals with Austria and Russia by increasing the land forces of the German army in 1888 by the addition of 800,000 men.

The next reign was to see the Austrian policy definitely adopted by the rejection of Russia, the colonial expansion definitely developed by the creation of a German fleet, and German pre-eminence in Europe expanded, in pretension,

to domination of the world. Hatred of England abroad, militarism at home, underground diplomacy were about the only parts of Bismarck's policy which survived his fall.

(5) 1888-1914 : GROWTH AND CLIMAX OF AGGRESSION (WILLIAM II.)

(a) 1888-1904 : *William II. and the German Navy. Pan-Germanism. Welt-Politik*

In 1888 William I. died ; his son, the Crown Prince, to the disappointment of the world, which looked for much from his more liberal views, succumbed after a brief and promising reign of six months, to a latent malady ; and the grandson, William II, succeeded, as Kaiser, to the German throne. And now began for Germany a period in which the cramping yoke of Prussian militarism was even more hopelessly riveted upon her neck ; for Europe a period of uneasiness, from which no nation—least of all, of course, Britain—was permitted to be free. As Austria had awakened to find that not France, but Prussia, was her besetting enemy, so Europe was gradually to realise that, not the growing power of Russia but the world-reaching ambition of Germany was the disaster which she had to fear. Just two hundred years after the Bourbon threat had died in the death of Louis XIV., just a hundred years after the Napoleonic menace had failed on the field of Waterloo, the Western world was to find itself face to face with the danger of another despotism from the very state which, after Britain, had been mainly instrumental in helping to suppress the last.

For a few years after his accession, the new monarch was regarded by many, both at home and abroad, as an

irresponsible madman, with a special weakness for dramatic display. Men watched with a tolerant wonder his "stormy petrel" flights to various parts of the universe and the flauntings of his "mailed fist." They were soon to realise that there was method in his madness and even in the mannerisms whereby it was displayed. In the first place, he got rid of Bismarck: apart from his disagreement with Bismarck's foreign and colonial views, he meant to be his own master; and in 1890, two years after William II.'s accession, the old pilot had to leave the ship. Secondly, there was the change in foreign relations: Germany now allowed her fear, Bismarck's fear, of the "Slav peril," of Russia, to subside, and more and more threw in her lot with Austria and the Balkan policy. But thirdly, and mainly, the new reign was distinguished by the development of Naval ambitions.

Colonial enterprise had already begun in the preceding reign: but it was obvious that without a navy this could not come to much; and, what Frederick the Great had done for the Prussian army, William II. decided on doing for the German fleet. The acquisition of *Heligoland*¹ in 1890, the year of Bismarck's dismissal, was followed shortly by the construction of the *Kiel Canal*, and the formation of strong naval stations at Borkum, Cuxhaven, and Wilhelmshaven: the whole making a triangle of peculiar strength. With the year 1895 commenced a period of colonial expansion abroad and naval activity at home; and in 1897 a *naval bill* laid down a definite quota of ships to

¹ Heligoland was ceded in 1890 for certain equivalents to Germany by Lord Salisbury, as a place useless in time of peace to Britain and untenable by her in time of war. How useful it was to be to Germany, was to be shown later when the strong fortifications, promptly constructed by the Germans, rendered it an invaluable basis for their submarines and aircraft in the great European War.

be built each year, the total number to be completed by 1904. And now began the feverish competition in naval programmes between Great Britain and Germany. In 1900 another Naval Bill was passed by Germany; and in that year, 1900, appeared in letters of gold, over the German pavilion at the Exhibition of Paris, a definite statement of the new German policy: "Our future lies on the water." Germany was no longer merely military: she had entered the arena also as a naval power.

It is probable that at this stage Germany did not *want* war with England. The building of her fleet, if it was directed against any one, was perhaps in the first instance directed against France and the French colonies: a continuation by sea of the late hostility by land. But she probably did not *want* war with any one. What she wanted was more colonies. The population of Germany had been growing enormously. Her recently acquired possessions—Schleswig, Posen, Alsace—could not be reconciled to German rule. Her foreign colonies in Africa and the Pacific were few in number; such as they were, they were managed in a way unsympathetic to the native inhabitants (lack of sympathy—*lack of a sense of humour* has proved the weak point of German mentality throughout); and the growing surplus of German citizens preferred to settle in the United States, Brazil, England itself, became naturalised to the countries of their adoption, and were lost to the "Fatherland." What she wanted was more land—land of her own, to which her population could overflow, and where they could still remain citizens of Germany: "a place in the sun." Unfortunately all the best places were already occupied; largely by England, and where England herself did not occupy land, England was forced, by regard to her own safety, recent obligations to France, and con-

siderations of international peace, to look askance at the occupation of land by a new comer. In fact, Germany had entered the arena of colonial enterprise too late; and now she had entered it, she seemed blocked, as already had Louis XIV. and Napoleon, directly or indirectly on every side by England: the mere making of a fleet was a menace to her English "cousins," whose existence depended on control of the water. While Austria, France, Prussia, had been busy squabbling over their empire in Europe, England had been adding country to country in her distant empire over seas, and now, with the attempted extension of the Prussian empire beyond European spheres, Germany the great land-power, and Britain the great sea-power, were to find themselves, as the sum of the ages, face to face.

But on to the Austrian policy, which threatened Russia, and the naval colonial policy, which threatened France and Britain, supervened other theories, sentimental theories, which threatened other states, the whole world. There was the theory of the Pan-German party, that the new German Empire should be extended to include all German-speaking peoples · viz. the peoples of the old Middle Kingdom of Charlemagne's Empire. Alsace and Lorraine had been already re-absorbed: Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, German Switzerland, were now to be included Denmark, Sweden, even England might be added later. There was the bigger theory of a world-wide Teuton Empire: the "Welt-Politik." Centuries ago, Teutons from the vigorous North had penetrated as soldiers, generals, governors, into every province of the empire of decaying Rome; had presently poured their barbaric hordes over the Danube, the Rhine, the sea, to complete by conquest the work they had thus begun; had ultimately created out of the ruins of the past, the "Holy" and beneficent empire

of the Frankish Charlemagne. The same preliminary penetration had once more now long been going on, and over a wider sphere, and more intelligently. Teuton trade and Teuton industry had gradually spread the meshes of their nets not merely over Britain, France, Russia, and other European countries, but over the United States, Brazil, much of Asia, and much of Africa.

In Europe itself it had even, if any new monarchy was formed, become the fashion to invite some Teuton to accept the crown; Teuton princes had been planted out on the thrones of *Belgium* (1831), *Greece* (1832), *Roumania* (1866), *Bulgaria* (1887), *Britain* itself had been under a dynasty, half Teuton in origin, since 1714; as to *Russia*, the court had been permeated by Teuton influence since 1725, and the reigning Czaritsa was of Teuton blood. And the Teutons themselves were no longer barbarians: politically still children, they were intellectually—in music, science, philosophy—head and shoulders above any other European state. It was the "mission" of William II to give effect for a second time to this peaceful penetration; once more to assert the supremacy of the vigorous Teuton over the decadent Latin, the barbaric Slav, the hybrid Celt; and, under the special Divine Providence, which had guided German politics since 1871, to impress the boon of this new Teuton "Kultur" upon the world in a Teuton Empire wider even than that of Charlemagne.

All this, of course, meant War. But the great German army was an instrument which was already rusting for want of use; the Austrian Empire, with its conflicting elements of Germans, Magyars, Slavs, and others, was now so doubtfully holding together, that it could only be fused into unity by the electric shock of war, and German historians and philosophers—*Treitschke*, *Nietzsche*, and the

rest—taught that war in itself was “a tonic,” that war could be begun on any grounds, that war could be carried on by any means. For Right was Might; international treaties were “scraps of paper”; and the received laws of humanity existed only for the weak. And the irony of the whole thing was that the Welt-Politik would have been realised without war at all. Another twenty or thirty years, and the world—so rapidly was it becoming dominated economically, politically, intellectually, by German influence—would have fallen to German supremacy without a blow. But “quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat”; and so undramatic an ending would not have satisfied the mind of William II.

Meantime, the three powers most directly threatened by the new German policy of outward expansion were drawing gradually together. Already, about 1889, in Bismarck's time, after the formation of the Austro-Prussian Alliance, and in spite of the Re-insurance compact, Russia had begun to gravitate to France. In 1891, the year after Bismarck's fall, Russia commenced with France a friendship, which ended in a definite alliance between the two powers in 1897; in 1898—a year which saw also an improvement in Franco-Italian relations over the question of Morocco—France, long irritated with Great Britain over the British occupation of Egypt in 1882, had in the “Fashoda Affair” her last great difference with the British Government; and in 1904 began the Franco-British understanding, which was to develop later (1907-1909) into the “**Triple Entente**” of Britain, France, and Russia. Russia, Bismarck's chief anxiety, was becoming frankly hostile; one of those Coalitions which he had feared was forming against Germany, and the Triple Alliance, which he had engineered, was becoming

weakened by the lukewarmness of one of its members—Italy.

On the other hand, France had not yet fully recovered from her defeat at the hands of Germany in 1870-71, Britain was still suffering from the effects of her successful but long and ill-conducted war with the Boers, 1899-1902—a war in which Germany encouraged, if she did not assist, the British enemy, and Russia was at this moment engaged—probably through the machinations of Germany—in her disastrous conflict with Japan (1904-5). So the moment seemed not unfavourable for German enterprise.

(b) 1904-1914 : *The Preliminaries of War*

The year 1904—the year which saw the real beginnings of the Triple Entente—was probably the year in which also Germany began more definitely to prepare for war, and all the wonderful German powers of thoroughness, organisation, and diplomacy were brought to bear on the work of preparation.

At home science was put in commission to do its best—or worst. The Germans, as they have ever lacked the sympathy to rule, so they have ever lacked the imagination to invent; but they have also ever been able to develop the inventions of others, to become supreme where others have once pointed out the way. All their knowledge, their thoroughness, their powers of organisation—for in this also they have been ever unsurpassed—were turned to the production of zeppelins, submarines, Krupp guns, mines, torpedoes, poison-gases, and other devices. New railroads were laid down throughout the country, new railway stations with many sidings for troops and cannon were elaborated along the frontiers; even beyond the frontiers, in Belgium,

France, Britain itself, cement emplacements for heavy guns were secretly prepared; while coal-ships to supply commerce-raiders were sent out in readiness to distant ports. For every German his paper of instructions was pigeon-holed, stating exactly where he must go, and what exactly he must do when he got there: only the official signature was wanting.

Abroad the previous *peaceful penetration* of the world by Germany could now be used effectually. German merchants, settlers, princes—even political representatives—supplied in other lands a ready-made army, all prepared, regardless of the rights of hospitality, the claims of patriotism, the interests of their adopted countries, diplomatic etiquette or international law, to do what they could by espionage, intrigue, conspiracy, at the requirements of the "Fatherland." German agents perverted the counsels of the Austrian, Italian, Russian, Turkish, Persian governments, or sowed the seeds of sedition in Africa, India, Ireland,—Britain itself. For it was part of the German creed that war should be waged by insidious corruption from within as much as by military aggression from without. Lastly, not least important was it to create in Europe generally an atmosphere of feeling favourable to Germany and harmful to her foes; the Vatican itself was won over to the Protestant, the German side—a task for which the recent action of Roman Catholic France in the expulsion of the monks had paved an easy way; and once more Pope and Emperor found themselves allied in a holy and imperial cause. The whole German military machine was to be in perfect readiness, with its wheels carefully oiled, and its course conscientiously prepared, for the appointed date.*

The appointed date was 1914. allowing for ten years' preparation. That was the year when the first blow was to be struck: arrangements, it is said, were even made for making the outbreak seem accidental. The programme of procedure also was drawn up: it was even given to the world by Bernhardt and other German writers some years before the procedure itself began. First, *France* was to be crushed again—this time she was to be "bled white"; then *Russia* was to be crippled; then—after a pause, necessary for the construction of harbours and for other naval preliminaries—hated *England* was to be invaded. It was unfortunate, in the real event, that the three Allies did not wait on the order of their coming, but all came in together.

But before the deciding struggle commenced the respective strength of the opposing powers must be tested, and the degree of their adherence to one another must be tried. Accordingly, certain "ballons d'essai" were sent up by Germany, to gauge the wind. Firstly, in 1905, Germany interfered on trade excuses in *Morocco*, where French influence was dominant. But the attitude of England showed that such interference would not be tolerated, and the episode was tided over. Next, in 1908, Austria, contrary to the terms of the Berlin Congress of 1878, suddenly seized *Bosnia* and *Herzegovina*. Russia, traditional protectress of the Slav states in the Balkans, protested, but, in the next year, 1909, Germany intervened "in shining armour" to support the annexation, and Russia, still too far crippled by her recent war with Japan to give effect to the protest by action, was forced to acquiesce. Thirdly, in 1911, Europe was startled by the news that a German warship, the "Panther," had occupied the Moroccan port of *Agadir*. Once more Britain stood

by her ally, Germany once more withdrew; and a definite French protectorate over Morocco was proclaimed.

The effect of the first test was to strengthen the friendship of France with Britain. The effect of the second was to strengthen that of Russia with both; and the "**Triple Entente**" between the three, begun vaguely in 1904, confirmed in 1907, became in 1909, after the Bosnian episode, a definite reality. As to the third test, that of Agadir, not merely were the Franco-British relations further consolidated by it, but France now came to a friendly understanding with Italy and Spain on the Moroccan question, and there was a distinct rapprochement between the three Latin powers. The result of the testing process was, therefore, so far, less to the advantage of Germany than of her intended victims.

But *Germany* knew her own mind, and wanted war. The three allies did not want war, allowed the wish to be father to the thought, and failed still to believe that war was really wanted by Germany. The earlier German preparations, the pronouncements of German writers themselves had passed unheeded; and now even the German acts of 1905, 1909, 1911 could not bring the lesson home. *Russia* allowed her fears to be lulled by the German agents at her court, *France*, profiting little by the bitter experiences of 1870, remained as unprepared for action now as then; *Britain*, like Troy in the days of Cassandra, stopped her ears to the warnings of the few patriots, such as Lord Roberts, who foresaw the end: a general state of unpreparedness in all three, than which no other proof could be required to show where lay the guilt of the coming war, but a state not likely to expedite success in war itself. Things were very near indeed to war after the seizure of Agadir in 1911; but this last warning

passed, and Germany continued to develop her warlike purpose undisturbed.

At this point two events occurred, which were neither of them on the German programme, and which threatened, each of them in turn, to upset the plans of Germany: the two Turkish wars, that of Italy against Turkey in 1911–1912, and that of the Balkan States against Turkey in 1912. The first ended in Italy's acquiring Tripoli, patching up thereby her difference with France over the loss of Tunis, and ultimately, as allowed by the defensive terms of her agreement, standing out from the Triple Alliance as a neutral, who might at any moment go over to the other side. The second, when Turkey was unexpectedly at the point of humiliation before the forces of the Balkan states, suddenly fizzled out. Bulgaria, equally unexpectedly, turning at the last moment upon her allies, and losing for all of them, herself included, the advantage which had been gained. In the first instance Germany had made the mistake of not supporting Turkey against her own more than doubtful ally, Italy; but the problem was a puzzling one. The mistake was not repeated in the second case. For the treacherous action of Bulgaria was probably prompted by the suggestion of Germany; who, by enforcing the failure of the Balkan war, furthered her friendship with Turkey and restored in the Balkans the position which she desired.

(c) 1914: *Outbreak of the Great War*

Then, with apparent suddenness, on an apparently side issue, the true facts of which will perhaps never be known, the Great War began—in the appointed year. The assassination on 28th June 1914 of the Archduke of

Austria and his consort by Serbians in the Bosnian capital was followed on 23rd July by the impossible Austrian ultimatum to Serbia—an ultimatum which Germany herself inspired, this by the mobilisations, ultimata, declarations of war of the various powers; these by the German invasion of Belgium—the final test, which brought Britain—though even then she hesitated—into the war; and, by the beginning of August, within six weeks of the catastrophe, all Europe was ablaze. The part played by France and Russia was by now inevitable, but the entry of England at the last moment was a bitter and unexpected blow to Germany. And the “**Triple Alliance**”—*Germany and Austria*—deserted now by neutral Italy, but still assisted by Divine Power, and later also by Turkey, later still by Bulgaria, found themselves opposed at once by the “**Triple Entente**,” *France, Russia, England*, and all England’s vast empire overseas, together with *Belgium, Serbia*, and Britain’s ally, *Japan*, to whom were to be added before long Italy, presently Roumania and various powers all over the world, and finally the United States. A formidable combination, to which the accession of England lent peculiar strength—at the same time, as a dominant feature of the struggle, once more bringing sea-power and land-power face to face.

But democracy—whatever else may be said for it—is a poor instrument in time of war; and two at least of the allies—Britain herself, and France—were hampered by the very freedom of institution for which they were to fight; while all alike were hopelessly unprepared, lacked unity of counsel, were working on outer lines, could only with difficulty give help to one another, and had some regard for the customs of humanity, for the usages of civilised warfare, and for international law. Despotism—whatever else may be said against it—is good in times of disturbance

and struggle; and both the Austrian Hapsburg and the Prussian Hohenzollern had always kept their respective countries under tyrannous control; while Germany had spent ten years preparing for the war; could bring one mind to bear not merely on her own counsels, but on those of Austria, and presently of Turkey; had the advantage of the interior position, which enabled her at will to transfer her forces from one frontier to another; and, untroubled by any scruples, was "out" to win the war by fair means, if possible, but if not, by foul.

(d) *Points at Issue*

1 **Interests of Separate Countries**

In any great war, where many nations are concerned, many separate interests also are at stake, many different hopes are cherished, many various feelings are entertained, and, as a war proceeds, fresh interests, hopes, feelings often emerge. On the one side *Germany* was fighting for colonial expansion, her Pan-German theory, a world-wide Teuton Empire, on which German culture might be impressed. *Austria*, now she had entered—or been forced by Germany, as in the Danish question of 1864, to enter—the war, hoped, no doubt, to extend farther eastwards her control of the Balkan states—even to work her way to Salonica and the Aegean; and, while Germany had gone mad with hatred of England, *Hungary* was mainly moved by old animosity against Russia (p 220). *Bulgaria* was actuated by her long-standing ambition to recover her ancient control of the Macedonian provinces. As to *Turkey*, her continued existence as a European power had long been trembling in the balance, and, as a last chance of recovery, she threw in her lot with Germany.

On the other side *France* now entertained a hope of "La Revanche"—revenge for the loss of Alsace and Lorraine in 1871. *Italy* had a similar hope of recovering her "Italia Irredenta," Unredeemed Italy—the district known as the Trentino in the north-east, and the long strip of the Dalmatian coast, both of which had been given to Austria by the Settlement of Paris in 1815. *Roumania* coveted her kindred Transylvania, inhabited, like herself, by a people of half-Latin race and speech. *Russia* was fighting to safeguard her Polish territory from Germany, to protect her interests in the Balkans, whether from Austria or Turkey, and, when Turkey entered the lists, to realise her ancient hopes of the mastery of the Bosphorus and access to the open sea. *England*, whatever she might gain if successful, was not fighting to gain anything, but to protect herself, her colonies, her sovereignty over the sea, upon which the safety of both self and colonies depended. As to *Belgium* and *Serbia*, they were fighting for bare existence, and, if things went ill with them, France, Russia, and England herself—even the states which remained nominally neutral, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, Spain, and Greece, might on their own account, at any moment, be fighting for the same.

2. National Principle, affecting Groups

These separate interests to some extent ran into groups in obedience to a principle, which had been becoming prominent before the war, and which the war itself was to bring out into special relief—the principle of *Nationality*—a principle largely, though by no means wholly, based on that of race. Many years before the Christian era (2000-500 B.C.) the great movement of the Aryan races—Celts,

Teutons, Slavs, Greeks, and Italians—had spread westward and southward over Europe, and even the union of three of them—the Italians, the Celts, and the Greeks—in the Roman Empire had not wholly been able to submerge the separate sense of race: consciousness of the failure was partly responsible for the subsequent division of that Empire into West and East. Then had come the second great movement (A.D. 350-800)—that of the other two Aryan races, the Teutons, followed by the Slavs, from the north—overwhelming the Western Empire of Rome, but the new “Holy Roman Empire,” built by the Teuton conquerors on the ruins of the old, had not been more successful in the suppression of racial feeling than its predecessor. Thirdly, introduced by the non-Aryan, Semitic Saracens from the South, who left little trace of themselves in Europe, had appeared the non-Aryan, Tartar hordes from the East—the Magyars in Hungary, the Mongols in Russia, and the Turks in Greece, the last of whom had completed the work of the Slavs and Saracens in the destruction of the Eastern Empire of the Romans, and erected the Turkish Empire in its place. all three—Magyars, Mongols, Turks—the last, especially—had even lost effect on race: remained, indeed, themselves an alien element in Aryan Europe.

In spite of migration, conquest, and intermarriage, national feeling has lived on, and attempted to realise itself from time to time, particularly in recent years. Mention has already been made of *Pan-Germanism*—a reality, even if used by Germany for its own purposes. But there was also *Pan-Slavism*, a definite, and real thing: with its sub-divisions—the aspirations of Serbia in the South, of the Czecho-Slovaks in the North, and of the Poles. And there was *Pan-Hellenism*. The *Celto-Roman* races of France, Italy, and Spain—helped, it is true,

by community in the Roman Catholic religion—had for some time been feeling out towards one another; and there was a growing rapprochement between the *Anglo-Saxons* of Britain and the United States. The principle of Nationality—based on race—surviving the changes of all the ages, and growing stronger from age to age, was to find its consummation in the great European War

3 Political Ideal

But in almost every war there is also some one big thing for which that war is waged by all alike; and in the recent war, underlying the separate interests of the different states engaged and dominating even the national principle which fused some of them into certain groups, there was a common issue at stake, which united one and all, on either side, together, which, even more than Nationality itself, was the outcome of all the ages, and which was to make the great struggle a climax in the history of the world: *Political Ideal* In fighting against Germany, the allies, one and all—even those who, like Russia, had only begun to grope their way blindly towards the light; but, most of all, France, accounted the most highly cultivated land in Europe; the United States, regarded as upholding the banner of self-government overseas; Britain, long since identified through all her Empire, at home and abroad, with the desire that others should, like herself, be free—were fighting for the maintenance of international obligations, for the right of small states—of *all* states—to live their own lives, for civilisation, democracy, political progress—were fighting against *Militarism* in the cause of *Liberty*

(e) *Conclusion.—Parallel of Struggle between Sparta and Athens in Peloponnesian War*

Many years ago a war broke out in south-eastern Europe, which, in the character of the combatants, the issues at stake, the antecedents and course of the war itself, bears a curiously close resemblance, if one may compare big things with small, to the great European War of 1914-1918, and shows how the history of the past may throw light on the events of present times: the *Peloponnesian War* of 431-404 B.C., in which Sparta, jealous of the growing power of Athens, engineered a quarrel with her rival, succeeded, after several attempts, in producing an outbreak of hostilities against an unwilling and unprepared opponent, and finally caused her overthrow. The Spartans, great in land-power, trained in camp, as a nation of soldiers, from their youth, believed, as an army, to be unconquerable on the field, able to acquire by conquest, but ill-fitted to govern what they had acquired; ruled by a cramping and close oligarchy; strong in individual character; unscrupulous: form a fair parallel to the *Germans* of to-day; while the *Athenians* resemble the *British* in their maritime power, the *French*, in their artistic and unstable character; both, in the democratic style of their constitution. Here, too, the various states which took part in the war had their separate aims, but the conflict was also one of race and race—Dorian and Ionian: more still, was a conflict of political ideals—Oligarchy and Democracy.

Sparta's preparations for the war—her tampering with the oracle of Delphi, her attempt to undermine the authority of Pericles, her bribery of individual citizens at Athens—are echoed in the pre-war transactions of Germany with the Vatican, with France, with Russia; while the

disbelief of Athens in the coming of the war finds its counterpart in the apathy of the powers opposed to Germany. Here, too, war broke out on a side issue—the quarrel between Corinth and Corcyra; here, too, as the war proceeded, the various Greek states were gradually drawn into it till the whole of Greece was ranged on one side or the other—as was practically the whole of Europe in the recent war. The Athenian expedition to Sicily and the British attempt upon Gallipoli; the effect of the arrival of Brasidas in Thrace, of Gylippus at Syracuse, of Salaethus in Mytilene, and that of the advent of German officers in Austria, Turkey, and elsewhere; the Spartan Alliance with Persia, the common enemy of civilised Greece, and the German Alliance with Turkey, the common enemy of Christian Europe are obvious parallels. And Athens even accused Sparta of poisoning the Athenian wells: just as the Germans were suspected of poisoning the wells in South Africa, just as they actually employed poison-gas and other devices upon the Western Front.¹

But the oddest parallel, perhaps, of all was the gradual interchange of character between the two powers as the two wars progressed—the growth of naval Athens on the field of battle, the growth of military Sparta on the seas, and the increase of the British land-army, the growing menace to Britain of the German submarine. In 419, off Naupectus, the Athenian Navy showed its supremacy with ease; in 415, at Syracuse, the tide was beginning to turn; in

¹ Yet one more parallel may be adduced, from the events which followed the ending of the recent war when the German prisoners in England were released before the surrender of the war criminals, in accordance with the terms of Peace, by Germany—At the “Peace of Nicias” in 425 B.C. Athens released the Spartan prisoners captured at Sphacteria (the chief advantage she had gained in the first half of the war), before Sparta had fulfilled her part in the conditions of the truce: as a result, that part remained ever unfulfilled.

406 at Arginusæ, Athens won only by turning a sea-fight into a land-battle; and in 405, at Aegospotami—

At this point, fortunately, the parallel of ancient Athens may be dropped, and the tale of later Rome and the Holy Roman Empire of Charlemagne may be resumed. The first Teuton revival of that Empire, under the Saxon Otto, had resulted in the disintegration of Germany, the first imperial attempt of the French under the Capetian and Valois Kings had left France crippled by Germany and Britain alike; the second Teuton Empire, under Austrian auspices, had, through the agency of France and Prussia, only increased, in Reformation times, the break-up started by the first; the second French interlude, under the Bourbons, the Revolution and Napoleon, checked by the coalition of Germany, Britain, and Russia, had left France open to enemies on every side.

In each case the issues at stake had been wider and wider, the peace of Europe had been more and more disturbed, and the lessons of failure had been driven home with ever-increasing calamity. But the fatal dream of the old Roman Empire in Europe still remained. And now, under issues which involved Europe from end to end, and reached even to America overseas, under ambitions more colossal than those which affected either of her two predecessors, the third Teuton Empire, combined by Prussia into a united Germany, was destined, after causing untold misery in every land, after calling in question the elemental laws of Right and Wrong, after shaking the foundations of the whole European world, to go down itself in a holocaust of blood and fire.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF EMPERORS OF "HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE" (FOR REFERENCE)

(*Charlemagne*, 800-814: Frankish Empire France, Germany, Italy Lothar and other Emperors of Carolingian line Charlemagne's Empire nominally, 800-1806 Separation of Germany from France at Treaties of Verdun, 843, and Mersen, 870. After 962, Emperors drawn from East Franks, viz. Germans the Elective and Hereditary principles being combined Carolingian line abandoned after Henry the Fowler, King of Germany, 918)

Holy Roman Empire of Otto.

(a) <i>Saxon Emperors</i>		} Supremacy of Emperor, 962-1056 (1 century)	} 1962-1254 : First Teuton effort. (Papal Period)	
1	Otto I, the Great, 962-973			
2.	Otto II, 973-983			
3	Otto III, 983-1002			
4	Henry II, 1002-1024			
(b) <i>Franconian or Salian Emperors</i>		}		
5	Conrad II, 1024-1039			
6.	Henry III, 1039-1056			
7	Henry IV, 1056-1106			
8	Henry V, 1106-1125			
9	Lothar (of Saxony), 1125-1138			
(c) <i>Hohenstaufens of Suabia</i>		} Triumph of Papacy, 1056-1254 (2 centuries)		
10	Conrad III, 1138-1152			
11.	Frederick I., Barbarossa, 1152-1190			
12.	Henry VI, 1190-1197			
13	{ Philip of Swabia, 1198-1208			
14	{ Otto IV (of Brunswick), 1198-1215			
15	Frederick II, 1212-1250			
16.	Conrad IV, 1250-1254			

(d) *Interregnum and various dynasties*

- Interregnum, 1254-1273
- 17 Rudolf of Hapsburg, 1273-1291
- 18 Adolf of Nassau, 1292-1298
- 19. Albert I of Austria, 1298-1308
- 20. Henry VII. of Luxembourg, 1308-1313
- 21. Frederick of Austria, 1314-1322
- 22. Ludwig of Bavaria, 1314-1347
(*Bohemian House of Luxembourg*)
- 23. Charles IV, 1347-1378
- 24. Wenzel, 1378-1400
- 25. Rupert Count Palatine, 1400-1410
- 26. Sigismund, 1410-1437

2. 1254-1437
Decline of
Papacy, Rise
of France,
Break-up of
Germany.

(e) *Hapsburgs of Austria*

- 27. Albert II, 1438-1439
- 28. Frederick III., 1440-1493
- 29. Maximilian I., 1493-1519
- 30. Charles V. of Spain, 1519-1556
- 31. Ferdinand I., 1556-1564
- 32. Maximilian II, 1564-1576
- 33. Rudolf II, 1576-1612
- 34. Matthias, 1612-1619
- 35. Ferdinand II., 1619-1637
- 36. Ferdinand III, 1637-1657
(Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648: virtual
end of Austrian and Spanish power)

3. 1437-1648.
Second Teu-
ton effort:
Hapsburgs of
Austria and
Spain
(Reforma-
tion Period)

(f) *Hapsburgs continued*

- 37. Leopold I., 1658-1705
- 38. Joseph I, 1705-1711
- 39. Charles VI, 1711-1740
 - (1 War of Spanish Succession, 1701-1714: Break in Spanish Hapsburgs
Spain goes to Bourbons
 - 2. War of Austrian Succession, 1740-1748 Break in Austrian Hapsburgs
Empire retained in female line—
Hapsburg-Lorraine)
- 40. Francis I., 1745-1765
- 41. Joseph II, 1765-1790
- 42. Leopold II, 1790-1792
- 43. Francis II, 1792-1806
(1806. end of H R E : Francis II
becomes, as Francis I, Emperor only
of Austria)

4. 1668-1815 :
French efforts
at Empire :
Bourbons and
Napoleon.
(1) Louis XIV,
1643-1715.
(2) Louis XV.,
1715-1774
(3) Napoleon,
1804-1815.

Emperor of French

Napoleon, 1804-1815

Napoleon III., 1852-1870	}	5. Third Teuton effort Hohen- zollerns of Prussia (Revolution Period.)
<i>German Emperors.</i>		
William I., 1871-1888		
(Frederick, 1888)		
William II., 1888-1918		

APPENDIX II

ETHNOLOGICAL TABLE

1. "Iberian" (New-Stone peoples) .

(1) *Iberi* (in Spain : Basques, etc.).

(2) *Legures* (in Italy, Sicily . Sikels, etc.).

(3) *Pelasgi* (in Greece, Asia Minor, Syma : Cretans, Philistines, etc).

(All three are regarded by some as Turanian, by others as Hamitic ; it being uncertain whether they came from Africa or—by way of Africa and Asia Minor—from Asia . Entering the three southern peninsulas, they worked up, or along, into northern Europe. As the Basques, in spite of difference in stature and physique, are, for reasons mainly of language and customs, considered their clearest survivors, all three are sometimes called "Iberians" (Lapps and Finns are probably "Iberian ")

2. **Turanian** (called also Tartar, Mongohan, Scythian, Ural-Altaic) .

(Supposed early home, Accad and Sumer, in Mesopotamia, then, spreading into great central plains of Asia, emerged in four great races.)

(1) *Mongolians* (north of Great Wall of China) . Scythians, Tartars, Alani, etc.

(2) *Tungusian* (Manchuria hence "Mandshus," rulers of China)

(3) *Turks* (about Lake Baikal) Huns, Avars, Turks, etc. (Parthians ?).

(4) *Ugrians* or *Ungrians* (hence "Hungary"), (N. Russia) .
Finns, Magyars, etc.

3. **Hamitic** :

(Supposed early home, Phut, near sources of Nile.)

Egyptians, Libyans, etc. (see *sup*, Pelasgi, Cretans, Philistines).

4. **Semitic** : from Arabia—moved in four great invasions. (1) circ. 2500 B.C., “Accadian,” leading ultimately to the establishment of Assyria and Babylon on ruins of Accad and Sumer; (2) circ 2000 B.C., “Canaanite” or “Amoritc” (see *inf* Note II), migration of Abraham from Ur; (3) circ 1350 B.C., “Aramaic,” Damascus, etc; (4) Saracenic, A.D. 622

[The first Semitic invasion, connected with the name of “Sargon of Accad,” a Semite, is by some authorities placed as early as 5800 B.C. If this view is correct, the foundation of the Assyro-Babylonian Empire must be regarded as connected with the 2nd migration. At any rate, that Empire became a real thing only by 2000 B.C. See text, p. 21.]

Hebrews, Arabians; Assyrians, Babylonians, Lydians, Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Saracens

NOTE—It is uncertain if the *Hittites* (p. 258) and *Etruscans* were Turanian, Hamitic, or Semitic. And the *Phoenicians* were probably half-Hamitic. (The establishment of the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings in Egypt, circ. 1700–1600 B.C., was probably due to a Hittite invasion, which drew with it the Hebrews of “Canaan” the “Exodus,” circ. 1200, being a “backwash” of this invasion.)

5. **Aryan** (called also Indo-European, Indo-Germanic)

(Supposed early home of Ariana [Bactria], Germanic plain, or S Steppes of Russia.)

(a) In Asia :

(1) *Iranians* in Persia, etc.

(2) *Hindoo*s : in India.

- (b) In Europe (of the Aryans in Europe the Celts moved first—circ. 1600 B.C. the order of the rest is uncertain, but all alike seem to have moved in two groups, or fallen into two).

(1) *Celts* (first centre, Gaul and Alps). Gaul, Spain, Britain, N Italy (later, Galatia)

(Said to have moved in two groups 1 Goidels, or Gaels [“K” Celts; in Britain, Picts and Scots], 2

Brythons or Britons ["P" Celts] (compare Kintyre in Scotland, Pentyre in Cornwall) [Cf note II]

(2) *Teutons* or *Germans* (round south of Baltic)

1. N. "Scandinavians" Danes, Swedes, Norse (Normans)

2. S.: "Germans": Goths (1 Visigoths, 2 Ostrogoths, 3. Gepidae), Vandals (half-Slavic), Lombards;

Franks, Alemanni, Suevi, Burgundians, Jutes, Angles, Saxons

(Several of these, e.g. the Goths, seem to have belonged originally to the Scandinavian or northern group)

(3) *Slavs* (first centre, Poland):

Venedae, Sarmatians

1. N. Wends, Czechs, Slovaks, Bohemians, Poles, Lithuanians, Russians

2. S. Serbians, Bulgarians (half-Hun), Croatians

(4) *Greeks*: Greece, Asia Minor, S. Italy, W. Sicily.

1. Aeolian (= Achaeae ?),

2. Ionian (= Pelasgian + Achaeae ?)

3. Dorian

(5) *Italians*: central Italy

1. Latins (plains on west coast),

2. Umbro-Sabellians: Sabines, Samnites, etc (mountains down centre)

NOTE I

Owing to the continued intermixture of these nations and the unreliability of language as a guide to race, a new classification, based rather on physical characteristics, is now sometimes adopted:

(a) **Mediterranean** peoples, short, dark, long-headed:

Iberians, Egyptians, Phoenicians, Carthaginians, etc

(b) **Alpine** peoples; tallish, lightish, round-headed.

Celts, Slavs, Hittites (? v p. 258), *Armenians*, etc. extending along the mountain-ranges from the Hindu Kush in central Asia to the Pyrenees in western Europe.

(c) **Nordic** peoples; tall, fair, long-headed

Scandinavians and *N. Germans* the *S. Germans*, together with the *Greeks* and *Italians*, being **Alpine**.

Nordic, though the last two also have often strong Mediterranean elements. Indeed, as to culture, the Italian ethnologist, Sergi, goes so far as to say that "the two classical civilisations, the Greek and the Latin, were not Aryan, but Mediterranean."

It will be noticed (1) that, except for the Hittites, the earlier peoples are Mediterranean, the Aryans mainly Alpine or Nordic, or Alpine-Nordic; (2) the "Mediterranean" peoples are common to Europe, Asia and Africa, the "Alpine" to Europe and Asia, the "Nordic" alone are purely European. The term **Caucasian**, once applied to the Aryans and to the peoples in Asia and Africa, living round the east end of the Mediterranean, and supposed, all of them, to have sprung from near the Caucasus, is now usually discarded: though still retained by some distinguished ethnologists.

(The terms "long-headed," "round-headed," are used not of absolute length and breadth, but of the relation between the two. Thus the length of the head is always taken as 100 then, if the breadth is 80 or above 80, the head is "brachycephalic," round-headed or short-headed; if the breadth is 75 or less, the head is "dolichocephalic," long-headed anything between 80 and 75 is called "mesocephalic," of intermediate breadth. The two styles of head are curiously distinguished by modes of burial "Long-heads, long-barrows; round-heads, round-barrows," seems to be a fairly well-established truth.)

NOTE II

The similarity of the **Achaean**s to the **Celts** is noticeable. Both entered their adoptive countries, Greece and Gaul, about the same time, circ. 2000-1600 B.C.; and the advent of both was synchronous with the introduction of cremation and the use of bronze. Both were tall, "long-haired," "tamers of horses," and have left several similar remains in stone. A Greek traveller, visiting recently the Celtic remains on Carn Brea, near Penzance in Cornwall, was struck at once with the resem-

blance of the Celtic "Bee-hive" huts to similar structures at Achæan Tiryns. In speech, the Celts, like the Achæan Greeks, have lost the Ablative and still retain the Dual. Lastly, it has been observed that the statues of half-Achæan Athens were often "round-headed" like the skulls of the "Alpine" Celts (See Ripley, *Races of Man*, p. 411.)

A third people, not dissimilar in some respects to these two, the Achæans and the Celts, and appearing somewhere about the same time, circ 2000 B.C., are the **Amorites** (Amurru): found first in N. Syria, on or near the Orontes; where the megalithic remains of Baalbek (Helopolis) have been by some attributed to them. Here they became subject-allies of the Hittites, taking part in several of the Hittite raids; and the Egyptian picture-records of those raids consistently distinguish the tall, handsome Amorites, with their white skins, blue eyes, and reddish hair, from the squat Hittites, with their retreating foreheads, high cheek-bones, large nostrils, and generally Mongolian type of face. (Sayce, *Hittites*, pp. 14-17, 101.) Forcing their way southward from here down the coast, or forced southward by the Hittites, circ. 1400 B.C.?, they occupied the mountains about Hebron, west of the Dead Sea (the Canaanites at this time held the plains); then, crossing eastward and subduing the Moabites, they established on the other side of Jordan the two great kingdoms of Gilead and Bashan: so far dominating Palestine that the whole country was once known as the "Land of the Amorites." It was at this point that Palestine was entered on their return from Egypt, circ. 1200 B.C., by the Hebrews. who describe the Amorites as "giants, sons of Anak," dwelling in huge walled cities built of stone.

But too little is known of the Amorites, as of the Achæans, or, for that matter, of the Celts themselves, to do more than suggest attention to the points of similarity.

NOTE III

An episode which occurred after the **Franco-Prussian War** of 1870-1871 is characteristic of the parties concerned; and its mention will form a not inappropriate conclusion to the present sketch.

While France was still smarting under her defeat, De

Quatrefages, Director of the Musée d'Histoire Naturelle at Paris, which (like the Library of Louvain in the recent war) had been shattered by Prussian shells, published a *brochure*, entitled "The Prussian Race," to prove that the conquerors of the French were not Teutons at all, but brutal Finns, or Lapps, or Slavs. The French were delighted. The Prussians, to whom the pamphlet soon penetrated, were furious. The question assumed almost an international form. Professor Virchow of Berlin arose to champion his maligned countrymen, and the new German Government authorised an official census of the colour of hair and eyes of 6,000,000 school children of the great Empire. This proved triumphantly that the people of the Hohenzollern territory were of the desired light-haired, blue-eyed, dominant, Teutonic type.

The objection to this disproof of the attack was (*a*) that the hair of a child is often lighter than that of the adult man—whatever might be said of the eyes; (*b*) that, in any case, though eyes and hair provide some argument of race, the main test lies in measurement of skull. But the Government had already given orders that the skulls of the Prussian army were not to be measured!